

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE FOR PEACE AND SECURITY STUDIES (IPSS)**

**ETHIO-ERITREA CONFLICT AND THE ROLE OF SCHOLARS AND  
INTELLECTUALS IN THE ‘STALLED’ PEACE PROCESS AND  
RECONCILIATION**

**BY**  
**FIREWEINI HABTOM**

**ADDIS ABABA,**  
**ETHIOPIA**  
**JUNE, 2016**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
INSTITUTE FOR PEACE AND SECURITY STUDIES (IPSS)**

**ETHIO-ERITREA CONFLICT AND THE ROLE OF SCHOLARS AND  
INTELLECTUALS IN THE ‘STALLED’ PEACE PROCESS AND  
RECONCILIATION**

**BY:  
FIREWEINI HABTOM**

**ADVISOR: PROF. HABTAMU WENDIMU**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE FOR PEACE AND SECURITY  
STUDIES, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY, IN  
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN PEACE AND SECURITY STUDIES**

**JUNE, 2016  
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**  
**INSTITUTE FOR PEACE AND SECURITY STUDIES (IPSS)**

**ETHIO-ERITREA CONFLICT AND THE ROLE OF SCHOLARS AND  
INTELLECTUALS IN THE ‘STALLED’ PEACE PROCESS AND  
RECONCILIATION**

**BY:**

**FIREWEINI HABTOM**

**APROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

_____	_____	_____
<b>Chair Person, GC/AC</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
_____	_____	_____
<b>Advisor</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
_____	_____	_____
<b>Internal Examiner</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
_____	_____	_____
<b>External Examiner</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

## Table of Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	iii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1.1 Introduction (Background of the Study) .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study .....	5
1.4 Research Questions .....	6
1.5 Significance and Purpose of the Study.....	6
1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study .....	7
1.7 Delimitation of the study.....	7
1.8 Definition of Key Terms .....	7
1.9 Research Methodology.....	8
1.9.1 Sampling Procedure and Study Area .....	8
1.9.2 Methods of Data Collection and Organization Procedure .....	9
1.9.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation Procedure .....	10
1.9.4 Ethical Considerations .....	10
CHAPTER TWO .....	11
Literature Review.....	11
2. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework.....	11
2.1 The Concept, Characteristics and Functions of Intellectuals and Scholars.....	11
2.2 The Emergence and Advancement of African Intellectuals.....	14

2.3	Conception of Conflict, Conflict Resolution, Techniques and Agents in Terms of Roles	18
2.4	Objectives and Procedures of Facilitation Methods.....	20
2.4.1	Problem-Solving Workshops .....	20
2.4.2	Forums .....	20
2.4.3	Multilateral Conferences.....	21
2.4.4	Dialogues .....	21
2.4.5	Conflict Resolution Training, Truth Telling and Lobbying .....	22
2.4.6	Peace Commissions .....	22
2.4.7	Insider Partial Teams .....	22
2.5	The Concept, Ownership of Peace Process and Peace Strategies .....	23
2.6	The Conceptual and Theoretical Aspects of Reconciliation .....	23
2.6.1	Methods and Techniques in Reconciliation Process.....	25
2.6.1.1	Healing and Forgiveness.....	25
2.6.1.2	Apology.....	26
2.6.1.3	Reparation payments.....	26
2.6.1.4	Truth and Reconciliation Commission .....	27
2.6.1.5	Writing a Common History .....	27
2.6.1.6	Joint Project .....	28
2.6.1.7	Tourism and Cultural Exchanges.....	28
3.	Historical Overview of the Ethio-Eritrea Conflict.....	29
3.1	Overview of Ethiopia and Eritrea in Historical Relations.....	29
3.2	Causes of the Ethio-Eritrea war of 1998-2000.....	30
3.2.1	Root-Causes of the War.....	31
3.2.2	Political Causes.....	31

3.2.4	Economic Causes .....	31
3.2.5	Socio-Psychological Causes .....	32
3.2.6	Immediate Cause of the War .....	32
3.2.6.1	Border Issue .....	32
3.3	The Early Engagement of Scholars and Intellectuals in the Ethio-Eritrea Conflict .....	32
3.3.1	The Principles and Techniques of AHPC .....	34
3.3.2	The 1991 Addis Ababa Peace and Democracy Conference .....	34
3.3.3	Peace and Development Committee’s (PDC) Conference at Addis Ababa Red Cross Centre.....	35
3.3.4	Peace and Development Organization: Engaging Ethiopian Traditions for Peace .....	35
3.3.5	The Continued Fighting and Reconciliation Efforts: 1998-2000 .....	36
3.3.6	Eritrean Intellectuals and the ‘G-13 Berlin Manifesto’ .....	37
CHAPTER- FOUR .....		39
4.	Why Is It Difficult to Implement the Decision of EEBC? .....	39
4.1	Ethiopia and Eritrea after the Closure of EEBC, from 2008 Up to Recent Period .....	39
4.2	Major Hindrances of Scholars and Intellectuals For Not Engaging Actively in the Process of Peace and Reconciliation.....	41
4.2.1	Division and Blaming One Another .....	41
4.2.2	Supporting Governments .....	42
4.2.3	Absence of Trust and Agreed Strategies .....	43
4.2.4	Lack of Initiation and Coordination .....	44
4.2.5	Divergence of Perspectives/ Problems of Narration.....	45
4.2.6	Absence of Independent Scholars and intellectuals/ political Affiliation .....	46
4.2.7	Financial Constraints and Reflection of NGOs Interest .....	47
4.2.8	Limited Intellectual Space .....	48
4.3	Possible Contributions for Peace and Reconciliation .....	50

4.3.1 Possible Contributions for Peace .....	50
4.3.1.1 Holding Conferences, Peace Dialogues and Peace Activities on Workshops .....	51
4.3.1.2 Formulating Policies and Writing Objectively .....	56
4.3.1.3 Educating People and Intellectuals about Peace/ Advocacy of Peace .....	57
4.3.1.4 Developing Bright Vision and Implementation Mechanisms.....	58
4.3.2 Possible Contributions for Reconciliation .....	59
4.3.2.1 Re-Constructing Common Ethiopian and Eritrean History.....	59
4.3.2.2 Efforts in the Promotion of Peace and Reconciliation.....	61
4.3.2.3 Effective Role Models .....	61
4.4 Peace Strategies.....	62
4.4.1 Pressure from the International Community .....	63
4.4.2 Confidence Building Measures.....	64
4.4.3 Consciousness and Consensus on Port Assab.....	64
CHAPTER-FIVE .....	65
5. Achievements and Failures.....	65
5.1 Achievements .....	65
5.2 Failures .....	66
5.3 Eritrean Intellectuals during the Dergue Period.....	67
5.3.1 Instruments of EPLF and ‘Great Powers’ Agenda .....	67
5.3.2 Historical and Sociological Mistake.....	68
5.3.3 Truth Telling.....	69
5.4 Ethiopian Intellectuals.....	69
5.4.1 Portraying Ethiopia and Eritrea as one Nation .....	69
5.4.2 Linkages with PFDJ.....	70
5.4.3 Argumentation Regarding Port Assab.....	70

5.4.4 Unable to Accept and Acknowledge Eritrea .....	71
5.4.5 Remedy Measures In Order to Overcome Weaknesses.....	71
5.5 Integration Mechanisms among the Population of Ethiopia and Eritrea .....	72
5.6 Indigenous and/or Modern Conflict Resolution.....	73
CHAPTER SIX.....	75
Summary and Concluding Remarks .....	75
References.....	78

## **Acknowledgements**

First and for most I would like to thank God who gave me the strength and inspiration to complete my study. I would also like to thank my graceful university, Addis Ababa University and IPSS; I appreciate the financial support of the University that fully funded my graduate study.

My warm gratitude is reserved for my advisor Professor Habtamu Wendimu who was kind enough to read, give constructive criticism and comments on my text starting from designing my topic up to the conclusion of this study.

I am also deeply grateful to Professor Tesfatsion Medhanie who supported me a lot through attaching the significant articles and finding a person to give me books necessary for my study. I am also indebted for much help to Doctor Mohammed Hassen, former head of Centre for African studies at Addis Ababa University who provided me with necessary books.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to Professor Kidane Mengsteab who had read part of my thesis, provided me with valuable comments and to have linked me with the most valuable informants. I am profoundly grateful to all the professors who accepted my request for the interview. Even if they are outstanding and respected persons in their carriers; they trusted, encouraged and showed me such a great respect. Thank you all who contributed positively for the peaceful settlement of the conflict!!!

Thanks to my family especially to Tigist, Helen, Abiy and Tefera who sent me with some of significant books and consistence assistance and friends particularly Henok Tsehay for their enthusiastic moral support and to all those who were with me throughout my period of study. In addition, I am also thankful to Mr. Getahun Kassa, Dr. Yonas Adaye, Dr. Samuel and Mr. Fana Gebresenbet who always encouraged me. Finally, I would like to thank you so much, all the people who have helped me with information and advice while writing this thesis.

## Abstract

*Ethio-Eritrea conflict is going on with no peace no war scenario after the closure of the Algiers peace agreement and despite the mediation efforts of many local as well as international actors. The conceptual meaning of scholars and intellectuals as outlined by notable academicians including Max Weber, Edward Said and Foucault in relation to their general characteristics and roles in current society; the theoretical aspects of peace and the actors involved for achieving it; reconciliation in particular some of the methods for reaching at are discussed in detail. Moreover, Ethio-Eritrea in historical relation and the causes that brought the war of 1998-2000 is depicted in an overview form. Some Ethiopian as well as Eritrean scholars and intellectuals had been engaged earlier on to resolve the conflict peacefully in various ways. The fundamental hindrances facing them for their limited contribution in dealing with the current stalemate has been identified and discussed in much detail. The most significant are the fierce division that existed among them, their stiff argument charged with 'ultra-nationalistic' perspectives and financial constraints. They can make possible contributions in the process of making peace and reconciliation between the two countries in the foreseeable future both individually and in group. Their contributions for peace can range from holding peace conferences, policy formulation and writing objectively up to advocating for peace. Reconstruction of the common history of Ethiopia and Eritrea and making a document, establishing reconciliation commission and being effective role models in advancing mutual deep understanding and cooperation can support reconciliation efforts. The peace strategy obtained from the interviewed data and published documents are also scrutinized. The international community particularly the UN, EU, and AU has to put rigorous diplomatic pressure on conflicting parties in order to break the stalemate. This is due to the fact that the incumbent political forces are antagonistic and the animosity among them is so entrenched. Integration among the people of the two countries is important. The previous achievements of scholars and intellectuals can be recognized in creating mutual understanding, dealing with many interlinked issues and their failures in areas of writing history and inability to acknowledge Eritrea as a sovereign nation state. Finally, in conclusion taking the good initiatives and peace activities conducted by different scholars, it is possible to avoid another devastative war and build on peaceful relations.*

**Key words- Ethio-Eritrea conflict, scholars, intellectuals, peace, reconciliation**

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

AAAS- The American Academy of Arts and Science

AEPAD- Association of Eritrean Professionals and Academics for Development

AHPC- Ad Hoc Ethiopian Peace Committee

Associate. Prof- Associate Professor

AU- African Union

CODESRIA- Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa

COEDEF- Coalition of Ethiopian Democratic Force

CPRD- Centre for Policy Research and Dialogue

EEBC- Ethiopia and Eritrea Boundary Commission

EEFF- Ethiopian Eritrean Friendship Forum

ELF- Eritrean Liberation Front

EPLF- Eritrean People Liberation Front

EPRDF- Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front

EPRP- Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party

Ethio-Eritrea- Ethiopia and Eritrea

EU- European Union

FLN- National Liberation Front

G-13- Group of Thirteen Eritrean Intellectuals

HOA- Horn of Africa

IAG- Inter Africa Group

ICG- International Crisis Group

IGAD- Inter-governmental Organization for Development

ION- Indian Ocean Newsletter

LPP- Liberal Progressive Party

MEISON- All Ethiopia Socialist Movement

NGOs- Non-Governmental Organizations

OAU- Organization of Africa Union

OLF- Oromo Liberation Front

ONLF- Ogaden National Liberation Front

PDC- Peace and Development Committee

PFDJ- People's Front for Democracy and Justice

PLO- Palestinian Liberation Front

PM- Prime Minister

Pres. - President

SIRC- Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre

SSHRC- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council

SYD- Swedish Non-governmental Member Organization

TPLF- Tigrrian People Liberation Front

TSZ- Temporary Security Zone

UN- United Nations

UNESCO- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

UNDP- United Nations Development Programme

UNMEE- United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea

URNG- Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity

US- United States

WPE- Workers Party of Ethiopia

WWII- Second World War

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1.1 Introduction (Background of the Study)

The conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea is one of the most protracted and complex interstate conflicts in Africa (Getahun, 2012). The period after the 1998-2000 war marked the beginning of new trends in the relation between Ethiopia and Eritrea in particular and for the region in general. The war had left numerous ramifications on economic, social and political life of both countries (Kidist, 2011). A total of 100,000 people had lost their lives and tens of thousands of people were displaced along the disputed border lands (Ibid; Tariku, 2016). Both governments engaged themselves in illegal, forceful deportation of Eritreans and Ethiopians which created sense of mistrust, hatred and suspicions among the people of these two countries (Kidanu, 2014).

Economically, both countries spent huge amounts of money and used their labour force for the war. Eritrea lost income from port services of Massawa and Assab and Ethiopia's access to the sea outlet was undermined. The war also hampered major political developments in both countries. Regionally, the continuation of the war with proxy outfit and intervention of the two states in Somalia's internal affairs complicated the peace and stability of the region (Kidist, 2011). The peace keeping body, United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) withdrew from Temporary Security Zone (TSZ) in 2008. Since then the two counties were under 'no-peace, no-war' status quo (Getahun, 2012).

The current Ethio-Eritrea, state to state relation could be characterized by political and military rivalry (Sally, 2013) and costly border stalemate (ICG, 2008). The governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea use the boundary commission's decision as an instrument for their 'zero-sum game' of weakening one another. The two states stances on the border issue still remain the same. They keep large battalions of soldiers along their respective border (Opris, 2012). Moreover, The Ethiopian and Eritrean governments support the armed opposition groups of one another through military training, providing bases, armaments and political advices. Eritrea assists the insurgent groups of Oromo Liberation Front (OLF) and (ONLF) Ogaden National Liberation Front (Kidist, 2011). Whereas, Ethiopia backed the armed opposition groups called the Eritrean Democratic Alliance and the Red Sea Afar Democratic Organization (Kidanu and Endalcachew, 2015).

Out of these spectrums, a conference was held in 2006 at Heinrich Boell Foundation with UNESCO and with intellectuals and scholars of IGAD region. It had been argued that efforts to bring Eritrean and Ethiopian scholars and intellectuals to the conference, who were supposed to be engaged in finding a peaceful solution to the conflict did not succeed. The political landscape prohibited a more cooperative and constructive form of conflict resolution which could make significant contribution to the Ethio-Eritrean case in Particular and the Horn of Africa, here after HOA, in general. In addition, it has been forwarded that now it is the right time for the intellectuals of the HOA, who has to design a holistic approach for the peaceful coexistence of its people (“In Quest for a Culture of Peace,”2006).

Some Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and intellectuals on their part have engaged themselves in dealing with the Ethio-Eritrea conflict and searching for lasting solutions. For instance, in another conference which was held in 2006, most scholars and intellectuals who participated from both countries disapproved the Algiers peace agreement as a genuine document to settle the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea (Leenco, 2006). Another most important example is those Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and professionals including religious leaders residing in the United States, here-after US are holding conferences with the aim of promoting peace, reconciliation and creating friendship among the people of these two nations beginning from 2009 onwards (EEFF, 2012).

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The Ethio-Eritrea war under the pretext of border dispute started in 1998 and ended in 2000. The war was devastative and concluded when the two belligerents signed the Algiers peace agreement. This agreement established Ethiopian-Eritrean boundary commission (EEBC) to delimit and demarcate the border. In 2002, the commission virtually demarcated the border between the two countries on the basis of ‘colonial treaties and applicable international law’ (Kidist, 2011). The EEBC’s decision of border demarcation was not accepted and approved by Ethiopia. On the other hand, Eritrea unilaterally implemented it. Eventually, the EEBC ceased its operation in 2008. Nevertheless, the boundary issue between Ethiopia and Eritrea is still contested and un-demarcated forming the basis for prolonging hostility between the two states (ICG, 2008). The Ethiopian government request for a dialogue stem from its refusal to accept the

boundary commission's decision which awarded Badme, the flash point of the war, to Eritrea (Kidist, 2011). The Ethiopian government's quest for dialogue with its counterpart before demarcation was not accepted by Eritrean government. This is due to the fact that the Eritrean government insists on the full implementation of the commission's decision without any precondition (ICG, 2008). As such the Eritrean and Ethiopian governments have failed to resolve the conflict peacefully. Therefore, the Algiers peace agreement neither resolved and physically demarcated the disputed border nor brought sustainable peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea (ICG, 2013). Given these facts and firm stances of the Ethiopian and Eritrean governments, imagining peace will prevail soon through the agencies of these two actors is unthinkable.

At the same time, the international community's involvement to settle protracted conflicts through peace mediation has not bear any fruitful outcomes and led to the continuation of no peace, no war status quo (Redie, 2012).

Redie (2012) argued that the conflict analysis and resolution methods utilized by the international community failed to address the complex and intermingled challenges the Horn of African states faces. Dealing with conflicts using indigenous methods has been neglected by these actors due to their geopolitical interests. A combination of these factors might result in either the transformation of no peace no war into full scale war or escalation through proxy wars (Ibid). Besides, the US government's negligence led to the continuation of the stalemate (ICG, 2008). The US is a major superpower which involved in the HOA. It has been greatly linked with Ethiopia to carry out its policy of "War on Terror". It accepted and supported Ethiopia's quest for a dialogue and tried to mediate the two countries through "shuttle diplomacy" but failed due to Eritrea's reluctance (Kidist, 2011). Thus, the international community did not come up with comprehensive solution to deal with the issues entangled in the conflict and peacefully resolve the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea (Daniel and Paulos, 2011a).

The regional organization named Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) and its role in the settlement of conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea can be said unsuccessful since it failed to ease tensions between the conflicting parties; to bring lasting peace and implement the peace agreement (Sally, 2013).

The inclusion of other stakeholders like intellectuals and scholars will contribute positively for the reconstruction of relationship and peaceful settlement of conflict. Track II diplomacy or sometimes called unofficial diplomacy is the involvement of middle level leaders such as international NGOs, churches and academics in conflict resolution (Seyoum, 2012). According to Daniel and Paulos (2011a: 83) “the contribution of religious leaders, intellectuals and other non-state actors is vital in promoting peace and seeking a lasting solution to the Eritrean-Ethiopian conflict”. They further suggested that the roles of these actors may be truth telling, clarification of the distorted version of the common history between two nations and reconciliation. These can be done without the consent of their respective governments (Daniel and Paulos, 2011a).

It is indicated that the academics and the public particularly the opposition groups had a different perspectives of resolving the conflict with Eritrea than the one held by the government of Ethiopia (Kalewongel, 2008).

The engagement of scholars in the search for peace between the two states was not that much effective and has been limited. When the war broke out in May 1998, Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars held a conference but ended up in complete failure. On the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of July, 2006 a conference was organized by five Ethiopian and two Eritrean scholars (Leenco, 2006).<sup>1</sup> Most of these conferences concentrated on the production of scholarly works and analysing the conflict instead of finding a more comprehensive and sustainable peace and reconciliation mechanisms. Indeed, the scholars and intellectuals engage themselves in extensive academic works such as conducting research, writing books, articles and journals and it is such great contributions.

Therefore, most scholars argue for grass root level solution to the protracted Ethio-Eritrea conflict with the active involvement and participation of different stakeholders including intellectuals, scholars, youth, religious leaders and Diasporas. However, they failed to discuss their role in detail and exclusive manner. Among them the focus of this study will be on intellectuals and scholars in finding appropriate and alternative methods to end the conflict.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Conference was held in Oslo, Norway and the participants were Prof. Bahru Zewde, Prof. Bereket Habte Selassie, Ato Berhane Woldegabriel, Mr. Dima N. Sarbo, Ato Gebru Asrat, Dr. Getachew Begashaw and Mr. Leenco Lata (Leenco, 2006). Pp. 1,5.

Given the contextual definition of reconciliation in terms of designing procedures for good neighbourhood relations between these two nations will be pursued by intellectuals and scholars.

The predicaments are identified as follows-1.The unsuccessful efforts and results of Algiers peace agreement, the two governments, the international community and IGAD to bring lasting peace and resolve the conflict associated with the absence of peace efforts in Ethiopia and Eritrea. 2. The peace process between Ethiopia and Eritrea has been stalled for the past fourteen years which led to the continuation of the stalemate.3.The intellectuals and scholars are ineffective in dealing with the stalemate status quo and their contribution for making peace has been limited. Hence, the enmity that existed between the two states hampered any peace dialogue and it is essential to assess the contribution of other stake holders like intellectuals and scholars in designing a road map for sustainable peace and breaking up the current stalemate.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The research will attempt to uncover diversified perspectives related to the role of the intellectuals and scholars to end the current stalemate between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The objectives of the study are:-

#### **General Objective-**

- To examine the possible contributions of intellectuals and scholars in the efforts towards the process of peace and reconciliation.

#### **Specific Objectives-**

- To explore and analyse the major reasons for the limited contributions of scholars and intellectuals in the search for peace and reconciliation.
- To understand some of the substantial joint peace strategies, this can be forwarded and developed by scholars and intellectuals in addressing the conflict.
- To assess the previous achievements and failures of the scholars and intellectuals involvement in dealing with the Ethio-Eritrean conflict.

## **1.4 Research Questions**

The research questions of this study are-

1. What roles can scholars and intellectuals play in the transition to peace, resolution of conflict and in reconciliation? And how can they play these roles in the case of Ethio-Eritrea Conflict?
2. Why the scholars and intellectuals play limited roles in the search for peace to deal with the stalemate and reconciliation?
3. What peace strategies were deployed by scholars and intellectuals to resolve the Ethio-Eritrean conflict since 2008?
4. What are the previous achievements and failures of scholars and intellectuals involvement in dealing with the Ethio-Eritrean conflict?

## **1.5 Significance and Purpose of the Study**

The study added knowledge to the ongoing Ethiopia- Eritrea discourses. Since this is new area of study, it will be helpful for policy makers, government officials and researchers who will work on Ethio-Eritrea case. It can contribute to the paradigm shift and transformation of dealing with conflict in a new trend using intellectuals and scholars as the major stakeholders. This study conducted with the conception of providing new solution with unique conflict resolution agents to the Ethiopia-Eritrea conflict i.e. intellectuals and scholars. It attempted to assess the consequences of the hostility between the two states particularly the period after the closure of Algiers peace agreement, in particular after the EEBC vis-à-vis the role of intellectuals and scholars to deal with the issues by analysing their perspectives. The study also analysed the intermingled and complex issues related to the unresolved conflict and come up with an advanced solution taking intellectuals and scholars at the centre. Track II diplomacy of using intellectuals and scholars has not given much consideration and this study demonstrated this untouched but significant area of conflict resolution technique. Eventually, intellectuals and scholars gained essential place and their immense capacity as drivers of change was studied and acknowledged.

## **1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Study**

The study focuses on the conflict related developments which have direct or indirect relation with Ethio-Eritrea conflict. The research covers the period from 2008, a year the EEBC and of course the closure of the Algiers peace agreement, up to present. So, the roles of scholars and intellectuals in conflict resolution are conceived with-in this time framework. This period is chosen because major developments occurred within this range of time and is a landmark in intensifying the tensions between two states.

One challenge is lack of sufficient literature on the area of study. It is difficult to find the scholars and intellectuals who are willing to discuss this delicate issue and share their experience. The researcher faced constraints in reaching some key informants due to death, sickness, busyness in their work and farness in places where they reside namely Europe and US. High ranking government officials are not been consulted and their perspectives are not been included in the study. This is due to the inaccessibility of Eritrean government officials and to keep the balance of information. The researcher also faced obstacles in getting the letter that was sent to the former PM. Meles Zenawi by Prof. Ephraim Isaac in 1998 for attaching it as an appendix.

## **1.7 Delimitation of the study**

The study did not take any position and its main objective is to demonstrate the way forward and how the two countries can come out from the current stalemate. This is done through searching for peace from the intellectuals and scholars side. The intellectuals and scholars are the nationals of the two countries who extensively studied the Ethio-Eritrea case. The study is pragmatic and assesses the realities on the ground. Therefore, the study is inclusive in its methodology as well as in its approach of data collection.

## **1.8 Definition of Key Terms**

**The Scholars-** are individuals who accomplished the highest degree and have record of research achievements (SSHRC, 2015). They are responsible for collecting, classifying and analysing the data (Bereket, 2006).

**The Intellectuals-** are defined as persons who have knowledge and engage in the continuous construction and criticism of knowledge (Barney, 1994). They are persons who have an independent authority and are not subordinate to a higher institutional context and are free of institutional constraints (Scott, 1997).

Since it is difficult to make a clear distinction in meaning between scholars and intellectuals, the researcher will utilize them interchangeably. Scholars and intellectuals collectively known as educated elites.

**Reconciliation-** is the process of renewing relationship through building trust, mutual understanding and creation of friendship. It is the transformation of relationship from mistrust and hatred to trustfulness. This could be achieved through recognition of past misdeeds, promotion of the idea of respect and common values (Jeong, 2010). In addition, reconciliation fixes relationship in a constructive manner even within the system of protracted conflict (Desta, 2009).

## **1.9 Research Methodology**

In order to answer the research questions the thesis is based on qualitative strategy of inquiry. This is found to be appropriate methodology in order to grasp the individuals meaning to the world they live in which is socially and historically constructed (Creswell, 2003). Also, it enables the researcher to know the understanding and perspectives of peoples and in this case that of scholars and intellectuals. Case study research method in particular exploratory technique was applied considering the study's main focus on Ethio-Eritrea and the roles of intellectuals and scholars in the settlement of disputed issues.

### **1.9.1 Sampling Procedure and Study Area**

The population of the study are Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and intellectuals. The sampling technique is non-probability which involves purposeful sampling for the Ethiopian scholars and intellectuals and snowball sampling for Eritrean counter parts. Some of the informants were also been contacted through sending emails. The site of the study is mainly Addis Ababa. Those who have deep understanding of the issues and knowledgeable experts who committed themselves in writing and conducting research were selected. Furthermore, the informants were mostly of

political scientists, lawyers, historians and journalists. They are given much emphasis because of their proximity to the case under study.

### **1.9.2 Methods of Data Collection and Organization Procedure**

Data collection involves the collection of both primary and secondary data as source of information. The primary sources were in-depth interview data collected from Eritrean and Ethiopian intellectuals and scholars and official documents. In addition to these, the researcher distributed questionnaire to the informants and obtained relevant information.

These primary sources were supplemented by secondary sources which includes books, scholarly articles, conference reports, conference proceedings, academic journals, newspapers including video speeches offered by educated elites and unpublished materials like MA thesis. The interview questions were open ended questions with semi-structured format. Interviews with Ethiopian scholars and intellectuals was conducted face to face and for Eritrean scholars and intellectuals since most of them live abroad it is difficult to conduct the interview in person, so the researcher was obliged to interview them by using Skype. This method also applied for some Ethiopians as well.

All the interviews either recorded using audiotape based on the will of informants or kept in a written form as a note. All the collected data was organized in the form of written texts and audio recorded platform either on daily basis or depending on the intervals of collection of primary as well as secondary data. The interview data was then transferred into written form. In each data organization process edition was done.

The study is divided into six chapters. The first chapter contains the major parts of the proposal of the research. Chapter two discusses the conceptual and theoretical framework of the study. In this chapter, appropriate concepts of intellectuals, scholars, conflict, conflict resolution, peace and reconciliation are analyzed in detail. Chapter three provides the historical analysis of Ethio-Eritrea relations. It also makes a brief assessment on the causes of the conflict and early involvement in the settlement of the conflicting issues. The conflict and ‘stalled’ peace process between Ethiopia and Eritrea is also studied. Chapter four extensively deals with hindrances faced by educated elites, possible contributions which could be utilized in order to break the

current stalemate. Chapter five deeply analyses the previous achievements and failures in their search for peace. Chapter six provides summary and concluding remarks of the study.

### **1.9.3 Data Analysis and Interpretation Procedure**

The collected data is analysed using cross-checking mechanisms of authentication through comparison of the information obtained from informants with books, reports and official documents. Moreover, the interview data from one informant is examined and made reliable with the other informant's information. The issues discussed are codified based upon the perspectives of informants and analysed in detail under the category of scholars and intellectuals with similarities and differences of the information obtained. In addition, data analysis involves detail understanding of discussion under each topic and subtopic by providing and interconnecting with historical facts and concrete examples. Interpretation of the study involves asking critical questions and making sensible meanings of knowledge from the collected information. The findings of the study are written in a narrative form and presented to the audience.

### **1.9.4 Ethical Considerations**

In order to avoid biases the study maintained equal participation of both Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and intellectuals. Moreover, it utilized documents written by Ethiopia as well as Eritrean scholars. As an Ethiopian born from an Eritrean father and Ethiopian mother, the researcher tried to be neutral and avoid biases. Indeed, the researcher's background as a history graduate is helpful in balancing distinct perspectives making equal presentation of perspectives. Confidentiality with regard to the information provided by informants is respected. The researcher never mentioned those professors who had been interviewed by their name in the text. The researcher only used the term informant and words like most, some and informants. The researcher respected the views upheld by informants and appreciate their willingness to be part of the study. All the data collected from secondary sources was appropriately cited to avoid plagiarism.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Literature Review

#### 2. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

##### 2.1 The Concept, Characteristics and Functions of Intellectuals and Scholars

There is a basic confusion/ misunderstanding about the character and role of intellectuals in contemporary society. Intellectuals are considered as ‘ new class’ of experts, planners and cultural workers in modern society who serves not only ones interests but tends to uphold ideas of truth, justice and emancipation. Konrad and Szelenyi (1979:4) (as cited in Michael, 2000) argued that intellectuals are not ‘free-floating’ but they are “representatives of universal values, transcendent reason and progressive ideas”. Gramsci (1979) (as cited in Michael, 2000) divides the intellectual in to two- traditional and organic. Traditional intellectual is speculative and socially detached, autonomous and independent whereas organic intellectual is reasonable and socially engaged discover the truth through examining the thoughts of common people. Intellectuals are those individuals that are adherent to the ideas of social and economic justice which makes it as a critical part of their task.

Edward Said (1994) (as cited in Michael, 2000) defined an intellectual as a courageous and independent individual who is forced to speak the truth to the authority. The intellectual must avoid subservience to the state. He further noted that intellectual is an individual who has the capacity of articulating, representing and organizing a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion for the public. The intellectual performs these tasks based on universal principles of justice and freedom. Nowadays, intellectuals are inclined more to be academic experts/ professionals. The intellectual’s main task is criticism and this task is unpopular and causes them problems. The values upheld by intellectuals include respecting arguments based on reason or evidence, respecting facts and criticism.

Julien Benda (1927) (as cited in Sandhu, 2007) described an intellectual as a person who is much in favour of critics and telling the truth. Richard Rorty (1989) (as cited in Sandhu, 2007) rejected the intellectual role of truth teller. According to him there is no “absolute truth” since everything

is contingent. Zygmunt Bauman (1987) (as cited in Sandhu, 2007) argued that an intellectual is a translator and interpreter of contemporary discourses.

The old style intellectuals concerns are 'freedom, justice, truth and so forth'. The contemporary intellectuals seek to involve themselves in clarifying and demystifying terms of community and participatory democracy. The definition given by Said functions in contemporary society and recent discussion that is underway on the roles of intellectual. Foucault's specific intellectual is responsible not for universal knowledge but to address questions by exploring on the areas of qualifications (Sandhu, 2007).

Steve Fuller (2006) (as cited in Sandhu, 2007) pointed out that the 'true' intellectual is the one who has autonomy and responsible for ideas beyond the scope of ordinary people. Intellectuals are also part of society. Collini (2006) (as cited in Sandhu, 2007) differentiates intellectual from ordinary people by the ability of enquiry and creation of aesthetic values. Intellectuals have the right to speak freely and they are possessors of original and extraordinary perception. The intellectual is defined in the information era as the one who passes through information and finds out the significant part of the information for the public and acted as commentators (Sandhu, 2007). However, the intellectuals are not power mongers and their criticism is not intended to snatch power from the government. Their criticism is great contribution for social transformation.

The intellectuals of the 21<sup>st</sup> c are different in aspirations and functions as to that existed before hundred years ago. There are ongoing controversial views on defining intellectual life and his/her role. Intellectual is a descriptive term and used for those professionals engaged in the development, manipulation and dissemination of knowledge (Fleck, Christian. Hess, Andreas and Lyon, E. Stina, 2009).

The words 'intellectual', 'intelligentsia', 'public intellectual', and 'academics as intellectuals' have different meanings with diversified roles, classifications and practices. As such the word 'intellectual' has many different meanings with controversies of each other. For some the term intellectual is used to denote those individuals with a university education. For others it means scholars, professionals and artists that think out of their specialised areas. The most common sense of the term is used to refer to those individuals with or without educational background who can influence the larger public for an extended period of time. The term intellectual came

into existence in the 20<sup>th</sup> c. It was used in the French language (*'les intellectual'*) towards the 1890s and includes persons such as writers, politicians, teachers and artists who were against the execution of the Jewish officer named Alfred Dreyfus. It was also used to refer to the philosophers of Europe and North America in the Enlightenment age of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. Well known persons like Adam Smith, Voltaire, Benjamin Franklin and Immanuel Kant belong to such group of intellectuals. The new groups of independent scholars, scientists and artists emerging in the early modern Europe before the enlightenment related to renaissance, reformation and the scientific revolution have also labelled as 'intellectuals'. However, the term was not being utilized in European languages until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. The early intellectuals were scholars and scientists such as Plato and Aristotle who influenced Greek society. Academics are individuals who have got an academic education and certification (Masters and Doctorate degree). Academics as public intellectuals are persons who are involved in translating knowledge and insights out of academic speciality so that it becomes understandable and relevant for persons outside of the speciality to the general public. Academic as intellectual is the one who holds ordinary academic position in a research university. Scientists and scholars in universities function in five different roles. As scientists in interaction with other scientists, teachers with students, intellectuals with citizens, popularizing specialized knowledge and use of such knowledge in public discourse, experts with clients and customers and members of organizations with other members. As an intellectual the academic operates in the roles of disseminator ("populariser") of scientific knowledge in different cultural contexts and as a debater in democratic public discourses. The intellectuals hold discussions with public aimed at improving political and cultural traditions and enlightened democratic discourses (Eliason and Kalleberg, 2008).

Scott (1997) argued that scholar is the one who has knowledge and scientific experience and oblige to maintain a high degree of impartiality. A scholar is also a duty bounded individual. Most of the academicians or scholars are not intellectuals and vice versa. Scholar's legitimate authority stems from their knowledge. The duties and responsibilities of the scholar and his/her effectiveness in political and public spheres depend on the professional code of conduct (Scott, 1997). The scholars are outside of the powerful decision making state bureaucracies and hence that they cannot be a major source of power. The only other source of power is the monopoly

right to bestow legitimate credentials and it is important that the authoritative status of specialized knowledge within the universities is maintained (Ibid).

Max Weber (1919) (as cited in Scott, 1997) demonstrated in his several classical writings such as ‘politics as a vocation and ‘science as a vocation’ the role of the social scientist or scholar is to contribute to the knowledge of the technique in which one through calculation controls life in external things, to develop methods of thinking, the instruments and training for such calculation and clarity. ‘Ethic of responsibility’ for scientists or scholars is an ethical orientation for seeking scientific guidance. There is relationship between the scholar, the state and the student. Academicians/scholars have power over students and they are state employees. What kind of contact between the scholar and student, and between the scholar and the state can both protect the relative academic freedom and identify its legitimate limits. How can an academician be a state employee with-out being the tool of the state? The essential answer is by being “value free”. “Value freedom” is part of the contract between the academic and the state in which the autonomy of the former is recognized and respected by the latter, and in which the scholar accepts that politics provides the appropriate public space for ideological exchanges. It is then only this contract which demarcates the line of separation between the scholar and the state in which the state is a “paymaster”. The state employed the scholar and self-censorship in certain areas is needed for freedom to talk. Academic freedom of speech is different from other forms of speeches or expression of opinion. This is because academic freedom is not and should not be subjected to non-academic supervision, surveillance, or even criticism (Scott, 1997).

## **2.2 The Emergence and Advancement of African Intellectuals**

Independence led to the expansion of education in most African countries and resulted in the emergence of intellectuals. African intellectuals lacked common sociological characteristics and features. However, some characters can be mentioned. Until recent times, they come from peasant and working class back ground and they were popular. Another prominent feature of African intellectuals was their Diaspora background. Brain drain driven by political push at home and economic pull from outside had affected Africa hard and eventually a significant proportion of African intellectual contributions emanate from outside of the continent. The period up to the late 1970s was when the first African professors emerged. During this period the relationship between the state and intellectuals was good. For the first generation of post-colonial

intellectuals, this was the era of affirmation of the nationalist project and rejection of imperial intellectual domination and neo-colonial machinations (Thandika, 2005:16). Zeneworke Tadesse (1999) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) described this period as euphoria not only with regard to nationalist projects but also material conveniences.

Sadiq Rashid (1994) (as cited in Thandika, 2005: 17) has characterized it ‘as a period of mutual tolerance and amicable co-operation between the academic community and the policymaking entities’. For African intellectuals the cultural correlate to African nationalism was not national cultures or ethnic identities but pan-African values of Negritude, African personality, conscientiousness, and so on. The intellectual aspirations and correlate to the nationalist quest for political and economic independence was intellectual independence. It was an aspiration that was quite broadly shared in African intellectual circles and across the entire ideological circle. The independence sought ranged from the simple right to set one’s own research agenda or identify problems specific to African circumstances to the fundamental question of the basis on which the West had captured the epistemological ground and how it had come to ‘know’ us or as to the extreme, to ‘invent’ us. Concern over development or, more practically, the eradication of poverty, ignorance and disease, the “unholy trinity” against which the ‘nationalists swords’ were drawn, was widely adhered and advocated in African intellectual circles (Thandika, 2005:18-19).

There was always tension between the intellectual’s critical mentality and his/her political affinities, especially among those who insisted on sycophancy and blind faith. The default position of the African political class was a profound distrust of its country’s intellectuals. The kind of engagement that the Indian nationalists sustained with the intellectuals in the post-colonial period, or the links that Jewish intellectuals had with the Israeli state, was rarely seen in Africa. This did not happen on the continent except perhaps in Algeria where the intellectuals were organic to the National Liberation Front (FLN) movement and government, and South Africa, where Afrikaner intellectuals were close to the apartheid regime. The first wave of the African intellectuals was absorbed by the state and its bureaucracies. Second, African governments relied heavily on foreign mentors, they were admirers. The more radical were to stay on as advisers to the nationalist governments. Thus Julius Nyerere had a band of foreign ‘Fabian socialists’ who had easy access to him, in sharp contrast to Tanzanians, who had difficulties in seeing him. Kenneth Kaunda had as a close intellectual associate with John Hatch,

who was invited to be the first director of the Institute for Humanism. Kwame Nkrumah surrounded himself with Pan-Africanists from Africa's Diasporas, such as George Padmore and W. E. B. Dubois. Leaders sought to acquire intellectual hegemony by themselves or through advisers, constructing intellectual frameworks that would guide national debates. Nkrumah with his pan-Africanism and Nkrumaism, Nyerere with his Ujamaa, and Kaunda with his humanism are some of the well-known examples (Ibid: 20-24).

The alienation of African intellectuals deepened in the 1980s, when the intellectuals accused the leaders for 'betraying the nationalist struggle'. The 1990s also saw the emergence of many movements and social concerns that had been submerged by both the nation-building and the developmentalist project. The second generation of intellectuals- African intellectuals began to critique 'developmentalism' not because material change was undesirable but because as an ideology it absolutized economic growth to the exclusion of other values such as culture and human rights. Over the years they have persistently raised questions about national sovereignty, development, the legitimacy of power, equality and democratization. By the end of the 1980s, African scholars' organizations began to speak openly against the suppression of academic freedom – a process that culminated in the Kampala Declaration on Academic Freedom that was adopted at a major conference organized by CODESRIA in 1990. African intellectuals are today much freer than they have ever been since independence. This also marked a growing self-consciousness of intellectuals as a social group, with rights and responsibilities. Large numbers of African intellectuals form part of Diasporas. Many still maintain deep emotional and intellectual commitments to Africa. There are, however, no structures within Africa to exploit their conscious or obvious desire to be useful. In more recent years, there has been a call for an 'African renaissance' (Ibid: 28-46).

As Mamdani (1993) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) has argued that there can be no renaissance without an intellectuals engagement to drive it. Such an African renaissance requires Africa-focused intellectuals. This will also require a major rethink and urgent need by both the political forces and the intellectuals of the relationship between them.

The Ethiopian intellectuals were not that much used as an instrument by the state and most of them were educated abroad. The maximum post they hold in the bureaucracy is director general

and only one or two had reached a ministerial status in 1935. They criticised the backwardness of the state. They promoted numerous socio-economic reforms besides the political independence insured by Adwa victory. The reforms include the introduction of tax system, religious freedom rights, and modernization of the traditional law known as *Fetha Nagast*, military and currency reforms. Above all the elimination of the *gabbar* system and the expansion of education were given more consideration. The then progressive intellectuals were given much emphasis for education and nicknamed as ‘Japanizers’ since they adopted Japan as their economic model which transformed itself from feudal society into industrialized society within decades. The weaknesses of the intellectuals were their ill structured and disorganized character which created a challenge to implement their reforms. This character tied Takla- Hawaryat Takla-Maryam who drafted the 1931 constitution and Gabra- Heywat Baykadagn, a leading Ethiopian intellectual of the early 20<sup>th</sup>c who wrote two books namely ‘*atse Menelik ena Ityopya*’ and ‘*Mangest-na yehizb astedader*’ with Lij Iyassu (young prince). Ras Tafari the then Emperor Haile-Selassie I of Ethiopia then became an ally of the intellectuals. Ras Teferi used the intellectuals for his power consolidation than the intellectuals had used him (Bahru, 2002a).

When the Italo-Ethiopian war was approaching the more traditional intellectuals established what was termed as ‘*Yagar Feqer Mahbar*’ or ‘Ethiopian Patriotic Association’. The leading persons were Makonnen Habtawald and Yoftahe Neguse. The latter used his poetic skills to convince the people to stand in defence of Ethiopia. The black lion movement was established in 1936 by a group of young intellectuals and members of the Holeta military school. It represented a high level of organization. The members of the organization agreed on to prioritize political solution over the use of force and to treat political prisoners in humanly manner. Later most of the organization’s members were destroyed in the Graziani massacre. Hakim Warqenah Eshate also known as Dr. Charles Martin criticized the League of Nations for abandoning Ethiopia and mobilized British public support for Ethiopian cause (Bahru, 2002b).

In the early to mid 1970s, a new coalition of Eritrean intellectuals and politico-military interests emerged and with it an expansive knowledge production program as well as Eritrean foot soldiers focused on depicting Eritrea’s nationalist cause to be well known across the world. Scholars had also been engaged themselves with the internal politics of Eritrean identity construction as well as the refinement of its dominant discourses. The best known advocates of

Eritrea includes Dr. Asmarom Legesse, Dr. Amare Tekle, Dr. Araia Tseggai, Dr. Gaim Kibreab and others credited for their substantial publications and public services. Dr. Araia Tseggai was the first Eritrean intellectual to make the nationalist case in a western scholarly journal called the black scholar. He was also the editor of Journal of Eritrean Studies. Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie a prominent scholar of Eritrean studies in the west and helped put Eritrea at the centre of a new liberationist discourse on Africa and the world.

Their ranks comprised of two major groups: Eritrean intellectuals in the west whose numbers increased steadily since the late 1970s and scholars, writers and foreign observers. Most Eritrean community of scholars, writers and researchers agreed that Eritrea was victims of “dreadful historical and political wrongs” and the world community had ignored the people who did not have much support (Olufemi, 2007).

Nevertheless, there is a clear distinction between ‘intellectual activists’ and ‘academic practioners’ who had been related with Eritrean liberationist discourses. ‘Intellectual activists’ are those writers, participants, scholars and observers who engaged in sustaining or changing the attitudes and opinions of significant groups in favour of armed liberation groups. ‘Academic practioners’ includes scholars and other non-scholars in which the question of Eritrea was practiced in a more professional academic manner (Ibid).

### **2.3 Conception of Conflict, Conflict Resolution, Techniques and Agents in Terms of Roles**

Conflict is a social phenomenon in which a minimum of two actors strive to acquire an available set of scarce resources (Wallensteen, 2002). Conflict is the condition in which the parties perceive goal incompatibility. It is also refers to overt and coercive behaviour initiated by one contending party against another. The parties in conflict could be individuals, groups, organizations, nations, states and other systems (Bercovitch, J., Kremenyuk. V& Zartman. I. W, 2009). Deutsch (1973) (as cited in Bercovitch et al., 2009) described five basic types of conflict issues. These are resources, preferences, and the nature of relationship, values and beliefs. Mitchel (1981) (as cited in Bercovitch et al, 2009) identified five basic types of issues in a conflict which is considered as causes of conflict. These are resources, sovereignty, survival, honour and ideological issues.

Complex conflicts have many underlying sources of tensions which emanates from both structural and psychological differences (Jeong, 2010). This type of conflict fits with Ethio-Eritrea conflict which has deep rooted causes and characterised by intense psychological disparities.

In clarifying issues representing points of confrontation, conflict resolution is supposed to explore opportunities for forging new relationship by facilitating peaceful change and reconciliation. Conflict resolution generally brings about a new framework for coexistence which eliminates the necessities of continued engagement in an uncontrolled fight for domination. Perceptual and attitudinal changes are aimed at reducing tensions which can in turn improve an atmosphere of searching for ultimate solutions. In the end the creation of interdependent relationship serve as a prerequisite for the development of lasting peace as had been the case of Franco-German relations (Jeong, 2010).

In the 1990s new forms of conflict resolution using approaches of dialogue, conflict analysis and problem solving became well known through the agency of third party intervention. The role of third party in problem solving approach includes facilitation, supporting other than forceful pushing. These are combined with the character of asking questions, clarification, challenging misconception and clearing the way for interaction. In 1990 Burton used the term 'facilitated conflict resolution' to explain the workshop method of conflict resolution. Joseph Montville described track II diplomacy as the unofficial/ public approach of conflict resolution as opposed to track I/official diplomacy. The broader definition of interactive conflict resolution (ICR) facilitated face-to-face activities involving small groups in unofficial problem solving discussion, in communication, training, education or consultation that promote collaborative conflict analysis and problem solving among parties engaged in protracted conflict in a manner that addresses basic human needs and promotes the building of peace, justice and equality. It requires process of exchange of perception, analysis of interaction patterns and exploration of options then development of alternatives/strategies and decision making (Fisher, 2009).

Facilitated conflict resolution method is non-authoritative and non-judgemental. It can promote mutual understanding and reconciliation. In the absence of official peace process, civil society groups organized dialogue forums to minimize misconceptions and hostilities between Israelis

and Syrians, Russians and Georgians, Armenians and Azerbaijanis (Jeong, 2010). The roles of NGOs and academic groups are significant for the resolution of interstate conflicts where it is difficult for international organizations and governments to engage in dealing with conflicts (Wilfried, 2007). Middle level leadership in conflict resolution involves leaders in respected sectors such as ethnic/religious, academicians/intellectuals and humanitarian leaders/NGOs. The authority of middle level leaders is not controlled by either government or opposition groups. They have connection to both top level leaders and grass root level peace actors. They are holders of certain status and influence in a society derives from their position of profession, institutional set up and so on. Their approaches in resolving disputes include problem-solving workshops, training in conflict resolution and peace commissions (Lederach, 1997).

## **2.4 Objectives and Procedures of Facilitation Methods**

### **2.4.1 Problem-Solving Workshops**

Sometimes known as ‘interactive problem solving’ or ‘third party consultation’, it is the unofficial interaction among people who are not directly involved in the conflict. Its main aim is finding alternative and sustainable solution to the conflict which would be acceptable by both parties. It is meant to widen the number of participants in the peace process, broaden the perspectives of analysis and seeking innovative solutions. The participants in the workshop are third parties and their major functions are convincing the parties of the conflict, facilitating the meeting and providing expertise on the analysis of conflict and processes of conflict resolution (Lederach, 1997). It seeks mutual understanding of security and other issues which contribute to the deep sensitization of positions between parties. An academically based, unofficial third – party approach is manifested particularly in problem-solving workshops. It is organized for influential/powerful social actors. A good example is scholar’s participation in a workshop and playing a positive role in resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict (Jeong, 2010).

### **2.4.2 Forums**

Numerous forums can be articulated for active search for transforming the root causes of conflicts. Impartiality is important in prohibiting the implication of bias in any forum which puts blame on one side. In the event of multiple participants, the forums can be divided into plenary

sessions and committees which discuss and aimed at reaching agreements at some points on contested issues. The forums have designed a process where-by people get together as equal participants to discuss a specific issue. The forums range from small study circles to town meetings; a non-adversarial environment has permitted citizens to take a fresh look at the topic and their own perspectives by stressing empathetic listening and non-judgmental attitudes. Successful forums have attempted to utilize social and political capacities to provide input to important communal issues (Ibid).

### **2.4.3 Multilateral Conferences**

Local-oriented conference arrangements can help make complexity more manageable as witnessed by the law of the sea conference in Caracas in 1974 and the Helsinki process for détente in the East-West conflict in Europe initiated in 1972. Such examples might be astonishing as these conferences did not involve a solution to the substance in the conflicts but only provided a reasonable process through which the issues could be handled. Conferences and confidence-building are mostly multi-dimensional and the role of facilitators is important (Wallenstein, 2002).

### **2.4.4 Dialogues**

Dialogues are designed to enhance mutual understanding and stimulate change in adversarial relationship. The long term objective of dialogue is to promote peace from below by encouraging collaboration among people who share an interdependent fate. In managing human relations, dialogue has been in a more general sense, referred to as a communal problem-solving process through building solidarity and mutual understanding within and between group members. Dialogue represents critical practice of sense making and community building. Deep understanding is an essential part of communication for shared understanding and action for transformation. A peace initiative involves the activities of building of empathy and confidence as well as reframing and reconceptualising the problems. The intent of a dialogue is not to come to an agreement over an issue, but to find common ground by understanding the thought of others. In seeking to reach areas of common understanding, dialogue adopts the format of listening, reflection and deliberation. The main goal of dialogue is a deeper understanding of the complex issues that divide communities, facilitating decision making for action. Dialogue fosters

trust, bonding and connecting. E.g. the Guatemalan National Revolutionary Unity (URNG) engaged in a series of meeting with leading political parties, business associations, clergy and academics. These meetings open the door to negotiation with the government in 1991. Another example is intellectuals who engaged in discussion of the Kurdish problem in Turkey and advanced efforts of influencing government to introduce reform. Dialogue can range from contact and confidence building to joint conflict analysis to explorative problem solving up to pre-negotiations (Jeong, 2010).

#### **2.4.5 Conflict Resolution Training, Truth Telling and Lobbying**

Educating people about conflict and empowering them with skills to deal with conflict. The trainings include analytical, communication, negotiation or mediation skills. These peace efforts directed at changing perceptions, acknowledgement of past damage and floating new ideas among actors proximate to the policy making process (Lederach, 1997).

#### **2.4.6 Peace Commissions**

The formation of peace commissions within conflict settings. The commissions are diverse in form and applications. It is the establishment of groups, networks and institutions that can play instrumental role in peace process. The middle range holds the potential for helping to establish a relationship- and skill- based infrastructure for sustaining the peace building process. A middle-out approach builds on the idea that middle-range leaders (who are often the heads of, or closely connected to, extensive networks that cut across the lines of conflict) can be cultivated to play an instrumental role in working through the conflicts. Middle-range peace building activities come in varied forms, from efforts directed at changing perceptions and floating new ideas among actors proximate to the policymaking process, to training in conflict resolution skills, to the establishment of teams, networks, and institutions that can play an active conciliation role within the setting (Ibid:49 -51).

#### **2.4.7 Insider Partial Teams**

It involves intermediaries who has the trust and confidence of one side in the conflict but who as a group provide balance and equity in their mediating work. It is also called conciliation effort. They also work within their own networks at all levels of society to leverage their relationships,

knowledge and expertise to bring about constructive change. They also possess a unique ability to directly and indirectly influence the conflicting parties' behaviour and thinking (UNDP, 2014).

## **2.5 The Concept, Ownership of Peace Process and Peace Strategies**

Peace is a process or a practice rather than an event, such as the signing of a peace agreement, or a commodity that can be presented for exchange (Roger, 2008). Bringing youths, journalists, intellectual leaders, religious leaders and community leaders from both conflicting sides who can develop interdependence and friendship are the basis for peace. Peace process led to the creation of new institutions, positions, constitutional frameworks, attitudinal changes and new relationship (Graf, Wilfried, Kramer, Gudrun & Nicolescou, Augustin, 2007). Peace is constructed according to the preferences of those actors who are most involved in its construction. Peace is a long term process and intellectuals/Academicians tend to focus on problem-solving approach (Jeong, 2010: 209; Richmond, 2008). Therefore, Peace is the transformation of antagonistic and destructive interactions into more cooperative and constructive relationships. It can only be achieved only when the root causes of the conflict and antagonistic relationship are explored and addressed (Hizkias, 2004).

## **2.6 The Conceptual and Theoretical Aspects of Reconciliation**

Reconciliation refers to “not just to the political arrangements to resolve differences and hostile action but to the psychological process whereby understanding and tolerance lead to readiness to live together in a new framework of peace and well-being” (Whittaker, 1999:1).

It is finding ways of addressing the mutual exclusiveness and hatred of the past without being locked into it. Acknowledgement through hearing one another's stories authenticates past experience or feelings and represents the first step toward restoration of the relationship. In reconciliation process people focus on their relationship and share their perception, feelings and experiences with one another with the aim of creating new perceptions and new shared relationship. It promotes an association between the open discussion of the painful past on the one hand and the search for the articulation of a long term interdependent future on the other

hand. It provides a place for truth and mercy to prevail recognizes the need to give time and place to both justice and peace (Lederach, 1997).

It is the most difficult condition because it asks for a deep cognitive change, a real change of beliefs, ideology and emotions not only among government officials but also among all sectors of both societies. It is a crucial factor in sustaining peace after the resolution of conflict and in transforming the relations between former enemies. It goes beyond conflict resolution and addresses the cognitive and emotional obstacles to normalization and promotion of peaceful relations. It means restoring friendship and harmony between conflicting sides after conflict resolution, transforming relations of hostility and resentment to friendly and harmonious ones. The historical record shows that reconciliation proved necessary for promoting peaceful relations between Germany and France, Germany and Poland, and Germany and the Czech Republic. The liberal approach argued that in the aftermath of peace agreement; reconciliation can take place using techniques of security, economic and political cooperation between the sides and hence enabling peace to go beyond the ruling elites towards the society. According to the social psychological approach, the reconciliation process should openly address painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for peaceful relations. This requires mutual willingness to apologize for previous aggressions, forgiveness, an offer of appropriate payments and a mutual perception of a just peace agreement, mutual satisfaction with the peace agreement and with the development of the relations, mutual acceptance and respect for each other's national identity and a willingness to open a new chapter in the relationship. It is a mutual and consensual process. It cannot be imposed by one side or by an external side (Bar-Simon-Tov, 2004).

Formal conflict resolution involves negotiation, bargaining, mediation and arbitration between the leaders who negotiated the agreement and in recent years it has become clear that formal peace agreement failed to establish genuine peaceful relationship. The process of reconciliation builds stable and lasting peace. The deep rooted, protracted conflict necessarily requires reconciliation process for re-building the relations between the societies (Ibid).

Reconciliation concerns the formation or restoration of a genuine peaceful relationship between societies that have been involved in an intractable conflict, after its formal resolution is achieved. The focus is on peaceful relations between societies since reconciliation requires more than

friendly relations between leaders. Stable and lasting peace is characterized by mutual recognition and acceptance invested interests and goals in developing peaceful relations, as well as fully normalized, cooperative political, economic and cultural relations based on equality and justice, non-violence, mutual trust, positive attitudes and sensitivity and consideration for the other party's needs and interests. The structural elements of stable and lasting peace in which the rival parties live in two states includes exchanging representatives in various political, economic and cultural spheres; maintaining formal and open mechanisms of communication and consultation between the leaders of the states, reducing threats and tensions by such acts as disarmament, demilitarization, reduction of military manpower close to the borders; developing joint institutions and organizations, free and open trade , cooperative economic framework, exchanging information and developing cooperation in different areas, free and open tourism and exchanging cultural products. Structural elements establish formal relations without spreading message of reconciliation among society members (Bar- Tal and Bennink, 2004).

The essence of reconciliation is a psychological process which consists of changes of the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the majority of society members. Therefore, reconciliation is the necessary condition for stable and lasting peace. Structural measures alone may facilitate psychological change but they cannot establish reconciliation. Reconciliation also requires a measure of complementarity between the psychological bases of the former rivals i.e. majority of both parties must support the peaceful relations. It requires that both parties not just become aware of but truly acknowledge what happened in the past. This is important because the party's memories of their own past sustain the conflict and block peace-making (Ibid; Bar-Simon-Tov, 2004).

## **2.6.1 Methods and Techniques in Reconciliation Process**

### **2.6.1.1 Healing and Forgiveness**

Acknowledging the past harm in political, economic, educational and personal injustices enhances healing and assists in restoring the dignity of past victims (Jeong, 2010). It enables societies to acknowledge the past, confess previous wrong doings or experiences of grief and pain, mourn the losses, receive empathy and restore a broken relationship. This is done through religious practices. It creates a space where forgiveness can be offered and accepted. It is

forgiveness that makes reconciliation possible. It symbolizes psychologically departing from the past for new, peaceful relations based on mutual acceptance and reasonable trust. The middle level leaders including religious leaders, academicians, and intellectuals mobilize the people for psychological change (Bar- Tal and Bennink, 2004:19-28).

### **2.6.1.2 Apology**

It is the first step in healing past memories not just simply forgetting what had happened. It helps to move on from human wrongs to human rights and responsibility (Jeong, 2010). Confrontation with the past especially violations were performed by one or both parties in the conflict. Through apology the past injustices and grievances are acknowledged and addressed. Apology is a formal acceptance of responsibility for the misdeeds carried out during the conflict and an appeal to the victims for forgiveness. It implies a commitment to pursuing justice and truth. It allows the victims to forgive and be healed so that eventually their native feelings toward the past enemy will change. For instance the Czech-German declaration on mutual relations and their future development signed in January 1997. Germany accepted responsibility for the evils of WWII and expressed its sorry for the sufferings and wrongs brought against the Czech people; the Czech Republic expressed an apology for the sufferings and wrongs perpetrated against innocent Germans expelled from the Sudetenland after the war (Bar- Tal and Bennink, 2004:28-29).

### **2.6.1.3 Reparation payments**

It applies when one or both sides accept responsibility for the misdeeds performed during the conflict and are willing to compensate the victims. The reparations offer shows recognition of guilt and regret by the perpetrator on the one hand and the victims' acceptance of the reparations indicate a readiness to forgive. For example compensation paid to the Czech victims by German government for their sufferings under German occupation during 1939-1945 (Ibid: 30). It also takes the form of returning the confiscated belongings or possessions which could be the seized land and properties. Like that of the Australia's government, it means establishing 'sorry day' (Jeong, 2010).

#### **2.6.1.4 Truth and Reconciliation Commission**

They are ways of dealing extensively with the past. Their purpose is to reveal the truth about the past and to serve as a mechanism for establishing justice. They expose acts of violence, violations of human and civil rights, discrimination and other misdeeds perpetrated by the former institutions of the state or by individuals/ groups. In this process, the revelation of the past allows the groups to construct their new memory and facilitates recovery. Such commissions have been undertaken in South Africa, Chile, Argentina, El-Salvador and so on (Bar- Tal and Bennink, 2004: 29).

#### **2.6.1.5 Writing a Common History**

It is recreating a past that can be agreed on by both groups that have been engaged in conflict. It involves a joint committee of historians who work together to collect and select materials and finally negotiate to establish an agreed account of the past events. It requires adhering to agreed facts and rejecting myths and unfounded accusations. The product of this joint work should allow the construction of a well-founded and agreed narrative that sheds new light on the past of both groups. These narratives provide a basis for the eventual evolvement of a new mutual memory that is compatible with reconciliation. They then jointly published documents which serve as a basis for rewriting history books, which can affect the beliefs and attitudes of new generations. It can also influence many other important cultural and educational products such as books, films, television programs and so forth. For example Franco-German Commission of Historians by the 1950s critically scrutinized the myths of hereditary enmity between the French and German peoples and revised the existing history books. They provide new accounts of the history of both nations, based on facts agreed to by the historians of both groups. The second example is the German-Czech Committee of historians presented a document of a common history. It is not always necessary to revise the entire history between nations; sometimes reconciliation may require rewriting only the history of a significant and symbolic event. Polish-Russian Reconciliation is a good example (Ibid: 30-31). Re-writing history to mutually accepted one would be the most significant part of reconciliation for Ethio-Eritrea conflict since there are divergent narration of historical happenings such as on accounts of prominent historical figures

namely Ras Alula, Emperor Menelik II, the abrogation of the 1962 Federation between Ethiopia and Eritrea, on the causes of the 1998-2000 war, “superiority-inferiority complex” and so forth.

#### **2.6.1.6 Joint Project**

It creates interdependence, mutual goals and benefits for the people. Joint projects in different areas can support links between members of the two groups at different levels of society such as elites, professionals and grass root levels. Members of both groups learn about each other and the importance of peaceful relationship. Joint projects take different forms. In the French- German reconciliation process, a project of “town twinning” from 1950-1962 which created 125 partnerships between German and French towns. By 1989 this project includes over 1,300 towns and established relations among secondary schools and universities. In the Czech-German relation reconciliation process, numerous joint projects were conducted with the aim of changing psychological rhetoric among young population of these two nations (Bar- Tal and Bennink, 2004: 33-34).

#### **2.6.1.7 Tourism and Cultural Exchanges**

It is crucial for the transformation of psychological outlook which depends on trust. If the members of the formerly rival groups visit each other, it indicates that some of the psychological obstacles to social relations have successfully been removed. Second, tourism provides an opportunity to learn about the past rival’s readiness to form peaceful interactions. Finally, tourism allows learning about the other group’s culture, history, economy, living style and so on. The positive impression created by Israeli’s tourism to Egypt on changing the Israeli’s tourist’s perceptions and attitudes is an excellent example. Effective method in interstate reconciliation is cultural exchanges. Various cultural exchanges include translations of books, visits of artists, exchange of films, television programs and exhibitions. These activities help to understand the opponents’ side in cultural and real human form. For instance Pakistani and Indian artist along the border who engaged in changing perceptions of the people (Ibid: 34).

## Chapter- Three

### 3. Historical Overview of the Ethio-Eritrea Conflict

#### 3.1 Overview of Ethiopia and Eritrea in Historical Relations

Bahir Medir (now Eritrea) was part and parcel of the Aksumite civilization. Adulis was the main trading centre for the red sea trade (Tesfatsion, 1986). Hence, up until the 1880s Eritrea was an integral part of Ethiopia. However, in 1882 Italy controlled the coastal areas of Assab and in 1885 assisted by the British it expanded and controlled the port of Massawa. In 1889 Italy signed the Treaty of Wuchale with Ethiopia which gave it full control of Massawa, Western lowlands and highlands which eventually established its colony of Eritrea in 1890 (Kidist, 2011; Tekeste and Tronvoll, 2000). It signed treaties in 1900, 1902 and 1908 and delimited its 1000 km border with Ethiopia. Italy administered Eritrea until it was ousted by British in 1941. In 1935 Italy combined Tigray and Eritrea as one province as part of Italian East Africa Empire. This further complicated the border issue between Ethiopia and Eritrea. After the defeat of Italy in WWII, Eritrea was under the British military rule from 1941-1952. The British proposed to merge eastern part of Eritrea with Tigray and create an independent state. The western part of Eritrea to be included with Sudan under Anglo-Egyptian Condominium and the southern-eastern portion including the port of Assab to be given to Ethiopia (Ibid; Tesfatsion, 1986).

The British administration differed from Italian colonial rule in several aspects. They allowed freedom of the press, publication of newspaper in Tigrigna and Arabic, freedom of association and formation of political parties. In 1943 the liberal progressive party (LPP) was formed and advanced the notion of independence. It was more in-favour of 'Tigrai-Tigrigni', the union of Tigrai and Eritrea. It had few followers from Muslim communities. It was led by Ras Tessema Asberom. The unionist party founded in 1944 and advocated the union of Eritrea with Ethiopia. It was the largest party and composed of members mainly from highland areas of Eritrea. In 1946 the Muslim League was founded and advocated for Eritrean independence. Its main area was in the Muslim communities of Western lowlands. There was no consensus among the big powers regarding Eritrea's independence or unification with Ethiopia (Tesfatsion, 1986).

In 1952 by UN resolution Eritrea was federated with Ethiopia. However, the federation was abrogated and Eritrea was incorporated into Ethiopia in 1962. Beginning from 1960s the boundary was not as such an international one but seized the character of administrative province. For three successive decades there was an armed struggle by Eritrean secessionist groups named the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF), founded in 1961 and then later by Eritrean Peoples' Liberation Front (EPLF), established in 1970 by splitting from ELF against two successive Ethiopian regimes. In 1975 the Tigray People's Liberation Front was established and was occasionally supported by EPLF militarily. The TPLF was also assisted the EPLF and defended its military base from attacks in post 1974 period. In 1991 the military government commonly known as Dergue regime was defeated through the collaboration of the two fronts, EPLF and TPLF. TPLF in collaboration with other insurgent groups established transitional government in Addis Ababa and EPLF set up provisional government in Asmara. In 1993 Eritrea officially became an independent state through a UN mandated referendum (Kidist, 2011).

After Eritrea's independence the two countries maintained good relations and signed treaty of cooperation on July 13, 1993 in economic, political, social and security areas. In addition they signed a number of treaties in order to cooperate in economic, peace and security areas in the Horn of Africa. They reached an understanding to trade freely, to exempt from imposing taxes on their products, to use *birr* as their common currency, to allow Ethiopia to use port Assab and Massawa and to allow the nationals of the two countries to move and work freely and so on. Nevertheless, the implementations of the treaties were not really materialized (Ibid).

### **3.2 Causes of the Ethio-Eritrea war of 1998-2000**

The 1998-2000 Ethio-Eritrea war was unexpected and shocked the international community as well as citizens of both countries. It had been given many names. Some scholars call it 'senseless war' (Mengisteab and Yohannes, 2005). Other scholars depicted it as the war fought between two 'brothers' (Negash and Tronvoll, 2000). Some others described it as 'prestige war, border war' (Abbay, 2001; Tadesse, 1999) and so forth (Redie, 2010).

### 3.2.1 Root-Causes of the War

#### 3.2.2 Political Causes

The two insurgent groups named EPLF and TPLF had disagreements since the time of armed struggle. Their main differences stem from different political ideologies. The TPLF was much in-favour of Maoist-style of socialism where-as EPLF adopted the soviet type of socialism. The military strategy of EPLF was conventional warfare but TPLF used guerrilla tactics. Their administration stance was and still is contradictory in which TPLF embraced ethnic federalism and the right of nations up to succession and EPLF uphold the creation of strong nation with distinct 'Eritrean identity'. The relations between these two insurgent groups were not smooth and their cooperation was only short lived (Kalewongel, 2008; Kidist, 2011; ICG, 2003; Redie, 2010). The Governance System suffered from lack of free press and control of foreign policy and decisions by one man and absence of opposition political parties in Eritrea and systematically controlled in Ethiopia (Kalewongel, 2008).

#### 3.2.4 Economic Causes

- A. **Currency**-In 1997 Eritrea issued a new currency called *nakfa* and proposed to trade with both *nakfa* and *birr* on equal value. This action is followed by Ethiopia's new trade policy which stated that Ethiopia and Eritrea will trade with hard currency not exchange their trade with either *birr* or *nakfa* (Kalewongel, 2008; Kidist, 2011; ICG, 2003; Redie, 2010).
  
- B. **Trade**-prior to the outbreak of the war, Eritrea's main trading partner was Ethiopia and exported up to 67% of its exportable products to Ethiopia (Kidist, 2011).The economic strategy of Ethiopia was the building of its agricultural potential and agriculture supporting its industry where as Eritrea inclined to export oriented free market economy. It is aimed to create Eritrea as industrial zone and Ethiopia to provide raw materials and markets for finished industrial products (Leencho, 2006). Moreover, Eritrea wanted its Eritrean residents in Ethiopia to invest freely without any restriction whereas Ethiopia put stringent restrictions on economic sectors such as banking and finance (Kidist, 2011).

**C. Access to ports-** In retaliation to Ethiopia's new trade or monetary policy, Eritrea imposed high tariffs on products that were imported and exported from and to Ethiopia through its port of Assab (Ibid).

### **3.2.5 Socio-Psychological Causes**

Even if, mere socio-psychological disparities cannot be considered as a cause to instigate the war, But it is perceived and taken for granted that Eritreans consider themselves as superior, civilized, exclusive and militarily strong (Ibid). However, Redie (2010) argued that Eritreans had strong assertions towards their independence which is achieved at high cost and wants to maintain their right and existence as people despite the sufferings and sacrifices they paid to be recognized as such. He considered these "superiority complex" as unrealistic accusations. These two perceptions collides, clashes and continues for decades without clearly and easily been managed and resolved (Redie, 2010).

### **3.2.6 Immediate Cause of the War**

#### **3.2.6.1 Border Issue**

Ethiopia shares its largest border with Eritrea which is about 1000 km. The border between Ethiopia and Eritrea was not demarcated and is the most contentious areas of dispute (Kidist, 2011; ICG, 2003). The war started in May 1998 when Eritrean military forces attacked Ethiopian administered territory in the western part of the border as asserted by the boundary commission (Daniel and Paulos, 2011b).

### **3.3 The Early Engagement of Scholars and Intellectuals in the Ethio-Eritrea Conflict**

Prof. Ephraim Isaac established the Ad Hoc Ethiopian Peace Committee (AHPC) in December 1989-1990 (PDC, 2016). Community elders, intellectuals and traditional leaders were the key members of the Ad Hoc Peace Committee for Ethiopia. These leaders had connections with the political parties and respected by their communities. These leaders had good speaking skills and

experience in conflict resolution. The members represented a wide variety of ethnic, religious and political backgrounds (Little, 2007). <sup>2</sup>The members were:-

1. Dr. Ahmed Moen, former Ethiopian Director General in the Ministry of Health and Professor of public health at Howard University.
2. Dr. Haile Selassie Belay, former president of the Ethiopian Agricultural College and former governor of Tigray, former senior UN advisor.
3. Mr. Kassahun Besrat, former Secretary General of Ethiopian Teachers Association.
4. Prof. Abaineh Workie, Norfolk University, former Dean of the school of Education at Haile Selassie University.
5. Mr. Fissehatsion Tekie, former secretary general of the Ethiopian Labour Federation.
6. Dr. Mulugeta Eteffa, former professor and dean of students at Haile Selassie I University.
7. Dr. Tilahun Beyene, former president of the Eritrean Teacher Association and dean at the University of Maryland.
8. Dr. Yacob Haile Mariam, prominent lawyer of political dissidents and lecturer at the Norfolk state University.
9. Prof. Astair G. Mengesha, University of Iowa, currently in Women's Studies Department at the University of Arizona.

---

<sup>2</sup> Prof Ephraim Isaac studied Chemistry, Music and Philosophy as an undergraduate student. He was the first Ethiopian to receive a Ph.D. from the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Science. In 1959, he organized the first Ethiopian Students Association in North America and served as the its first president for three years and transformed this organization into Ethiopian Literacy Committee and chaired, see also Little, David (eds.). (2007). *Peace Makers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*.

AHPC had two main offices. One was in Princeton, New Jersey where Prof. Ephraim served as director while he taught as a visiting professor for a year at a seminary and for seven years at a Princeton University. The other was in Uppsala, Sweden where support came from the Life and Peace Institute. Locally contacts were made with elders in Ethiopia who remained close to developing conflicts (Little, 2007: 165).

### **3.3.1 The Principles and Techniques of AHPC**

AHPC's elders and intellectuals agreed on certain ground rules. First, they agreed that they would not speak to the media. Once the media reports what people said, it disrupts the peace efforts. Second, the elders agreed to distance themselves from the conflicting parties so that they could act strictly as mediators for peace. They signed out "*Shimagele-jarsa*", a traditional Ethiopian technique that supports efforts to resolve conflicts. It is characterized by sympathetic listening, respect for the opponent, patience, open-mindedness, impartiality and advocacy for serious dialogue. The Participants had a commitment to Ethiopian peace and approached all the groups involved in the conflict either through oral or written correspondence (Ibid: 165-166; PDC, 2016).

### **3.3.2 The 1991 Addis Ababa Peace and Democracy Conference**

When the London peace talks ended in 1991, Prof. Ephraim and Dr. Haile Selassie Belay had extensive private discussions with the three top leaders of the opposition parties (the late Prime Minister of Ethiopia, President of Eritrea and the Chairman of Oromo Liberation Front) regarding how to establish a lasting peace in the Horn of Africa (Ibid:168).

AHPC was an observer when the political parties met in Addis Ababa in 1991. The leader of the Ethiopian Coalition, Mr. Meles Zenawi chaired the conference. Most of the important parties participated with the exception of two socialist groups (the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party and MEISON) who had joined forces a year earlier to form the Coalition of Ethiopian Democratic Forces (COEDF). Despite pleas from Prof. Ephraim and the AHPC, this group hesitated to sign onto the unequivocal commitment to peace, as representatives from all the parties had done. Prof. Ephraim was troubled by their non-participation and predicted that if they did not join, true reconciliation in Ethiopia would be impossible. Two important decisions were made in this conference. First the Eritrean people would remain part of Ethiopia for two years,

after which they would determine their fate in a 1993 referendum. Second, the transitional government would be determined by a system of proportional representation, which would include all the major opposition groups. Mr Meles Zenawi, the late Prime Minister of Ethiopia, became president of the new transitional government of Ethiopia. Members of the AHPC approached the political parties to bid them farewell at the end of the conference, it became clear that although a type of peace had come, reconciliation had not yet been achieved. The AHPC members decided to continue under a new name, The Peace and Development Committee (PDC) (Ibid: 169-170).

### **3.3.3 Peace and Development Committee's (PDC) Conference at Addis Ababa Red Cross Centre**

The PDC opened an office in Addis Ababa and became the first local NGO in Ethiopia and began its operation in 1992. Its mission was to enable peace to take root and flourish across Ethiopia and Eritrea. Dr. Haile Selassie Belay was the first director general of PDC. It held a conference organized by Dr. Haile Selassie and Prof. Ephraim which was sponsored by the new PDC with the assistance of the Swedish Life and Peace Institute and the German Evangelical Church. Church leaders, Muslims, Christians, Jews, elders, civil servants, religious leaders, business people, government officials, women leaders, youth and representatives of various organizations came together at the Addis Ababa Red Cross Centre to talk about reconciliation among all Ethiopian political, ethnic and religious groups. Prof. Ephraim gave a speech of strengthening the ongoing peace and reconciliation process (Ibid: 171-172).

### **3.3.4 Peace and Development Organization: Engaging Ethiopian Traditions for Peace**

Prof Ephraim wrote a letter to the late Prime Minister of Ethiopia and the President of Eritrea and proposed that they must establish a '**Ministry of Peace and Reconciliation**' to parallel with the Ministry of Defence. He dreamed of an 'army' of young people who will be supported and trained for the purpose of resolving conflict. They would use neither guns nor force but would work instead by means of persuasion and dialogue. Whenever, a conflict began to develop, they would be dispatched. Though intrigued by the idea, the Prime Minister and President argued that the war had utilized their resources, leaving no money to carry out this suggestion (Ibid: 173). However, they had budget to wage war which killed almost 100,000 lives, displaced millions of people and to maintain for almost more than a decade a costly border stalemate. Then the

organization established network of peace maker elders. His idea was to go to every village in Ethiopia and ask the people to identify the elders of their community those people known for their kindness, wisdom and love of peace (Little, 2007: 173).

Prof. Ephraim was invited as an observer when Eritreans voted for autonomy during the 1993 referendum for Eritrean independence. To sustain the peace Prof. Ephraim urged that the leaders to build grassroots collaboration across borders. Although they endorsed the idea, many people felt that the Ethiopian-Eritrean conflict was a ‘finished business’ and that this type of effort was not necessary. Unfortunately, time and history proved them wrong (Ibid: 174).

### **3.3.5 The Continued Fighting and Reconciliation Efforts: 1998-2000**

As soon as the war broke out in May 1998, Prof. Ephraim met with his elders and intellectuals in the United States, called the office in Addis Ababa and coordinated with the offices of Prime Minister Meles and President Isaias to arrange a meeting with the elders and each side respectively. The idea was welcomed by all and the first meeting in Addis Ababa went smoothly. However, they cannot go to Asmara, the capital city of Eritrea by land due to the ongoing war. They took a small plane but the flight was interrupted when the plane had some equipment problems. The emergency landing put the elders at risk of attack from soldiers fighting in the region. Ultimately, they were rescued by the UN which provided its own small plane from Somaliland. They held their meeting with president Isaias and also met with refugees exiled from Ethiopia. When they finally returned to Addis Ababa, it was to develop proposals to resolve the conflict (Ibid). He continued to make unpublicized flights to Addis Ababa and Asmara meeting privately with PM. Meles and Pres. Isaias respectively. However, the efforts did not accomplish its intended purpose (Bereket, 2011). Prof. Ephraim flew to Asmara through Yemen. When he could not make personal visits, he mediated using faxes. Prof. Ephraim helped the two leaders discuss the 14 border towns in dispute. He and the members received cooperation and assistance of the US, Germany, Norway, the UN and OAU. He argues that the use of multiple levels of peace making(Track I diplomacy as well as his Track II diplomatic efforts) was not the most effective methodology of resolving the Ethio-Eritrean conflict (Little, 2007:175-176).

In June 1999, another effort was made before the Algiers peace agreement by a Japanese organization known as “Peace Boat” at resolving the conflict peacefully. It organized joint

meetings between Eritrean and Ethiopian scholars, and offered financial resources with Japanese government backing to build development institutions around the disputed area as an incentive, in order to encourage the warring states to resolve the conflict through peaceful means. It was attended by Prof. Andreas Eshete, Prof. Bereket Habte Selassie, Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and Mr. Kifle Wodajo. The effort terminated as the war escalated between the two states (Bereket, 2011).

### **3.3.6 Eritrean Intellectuals and the ‘G-13 Berlin Manifesto’**

The letter was sent to the Eritrean pres. Isaias Afwerki by a group of thirteen individuals that participated in the construction of the letter was known as G-13 (Group of Thirteen Eritrean intellectuals). In October 3, 2000 well known Eritrean intellectuals/ academicians and professionals met in Berlin, Germany to make an appraisal of Eritrea’s predicaments and to suggest appropriate solutions (Thewodros, 2014). The meeting was funded by a German non-governmental organization that promotes democracy and good governance called Heinrich Boll Foundation (Mohammed, 2011). As a result of their discussions they articulated and sent a private letter in which they expressed their concerns about critical issues of the war including the humanitarian crisis that the war brought to Eritrea, the need for national unity and reconciliation, participatory democracy and above all the implementation of the constitution (Bereket, 2011;Thewodros, 2014). The international news agencies echoed the message of the letter worldwide. The Indian Ocean Newsletter (ION) in its October 2000 edition described it as the ‘Rebel of the Intelligentsia’ and also the British Broadcasting Corporation(BBC) released news item entitled ‘Eritrea Confronts the Future’ and stated that the most famous criticism is forwarded in ‘Berlin Manifesto’ (Mohammed, 2011). The letter coming from such intellectuals and at such critical moment was very significant that the president was willing to meet with them in Eritrean capital, Asmara in November 25, 2000 during which much of the concerns was outlined and discussed. The letter and the meeting were brought to the public via the private newspapers. The letter was a big step which opened the door for further criticism and dissent. The reaction of the president to the academicians and professionals seemed welcoming at first when a meeting was convened in Asmara in November 2000. The president dismissed their concerns by explaining that Eritrea was in an emergency condition and expressed his contempt by describing them as ‘mere intellectuals’. Nevertheless, the people of Eritrea considered and viewed these groups of intellectuals with great admiration for their bold character and timely

action they took. However, later on government media agency discredited them as a subversive group in spite of their perseverance that they were not a political group or affiliated to any political tendencies. The president excluded intellectuals who could have made a great contribution to Eritrea both in time of progress as well as in time of stress. Even then, the government termed the intellectuals as a dangerous threat to the ‘sovereignty, security and peace of the nation’ together with journalists and the political group called G-15 (Thewodros, 2014).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> G-15 was an opposition group organized by fifteen prominent veteran leaders of EPLF and determined to challenge Pres. Isaias. They raised public feelings against the war and the way it was conducted in which the Berlin manifesto pointed out (Bereket, 2011:183,188).

## CHAPTER- FOUR

### 4. Why Is It Difficult to Implement the Decision of EEBC?

The Algiers peace agreement had achieved a cease fire between the two states but other provisions of the agreement have only been partially implemented. One of the weaknesses of the agreement is its prioritization of the border issue which make it difficult to construct on the potential of economic interdependence and close familial and cultural ties of the two peoples for regional peace. It is a binding agreement but lacks enforcement mechanisms for achieving peace. Above all, it did not give much consideration for the root-causes of the conflict between the two states such as economic, political and other interrelated issues. Hence, it transformed the conflict from war into no peace, no war in which both governments increasingly provided their political, financial, and military support for the opposition sides of one another.<sup>4</sup>

#### 4.1 Ethiopia and Eritrea after the Closure of EEBC, from 2008 Up to Recent Period

The Horn of Africa is one of the most conflict ridden regions of the world. Its people had suffered a lot by the endless wars. The no peace, no war stalemate that existed between Ethiopia and Eritrea during the last fourteen years has negatively affects the lives of millions of people in both countries and the peace and security of the whole region. As bad as an open war is, an endless no war no peace situation is equally sufferable. This no-peace, no-war stalemate has its own interrelated economic, social, political and security problems (Tariku, 2016).

The no peace no war stalemate terminated all trade and economic relations. People's movement and economic activities were not hindered even during those thirty years of war for independence. The people-to- people relation and cultural exchanges were strong back then. Now, the stalemate is destroying the "fraternal" relationship of the people of these two countries. Today Ethiopia is providing the necessary treatment for Eritreans who are considered as refugees and Eritrean youths are learning in universities. This is an appreciable move but needs to end the stale mate, normalize relations and rearrange free movement of people (Ibid).

---

<sup>4</sup> ICG, 2008, pp. 2-6. More on the weaknesses of the Algiers peace agreement see also Kalewongel Menale's. Ethiopia and Eritrea: The Quest for Peace and Normalization. pp. 75-81.

Politically, it means “diplomatic games” to undermine and isolate one over the other. Both Ethiopia and Eritrea wants to be an ally of US. Since Ethiopia and Eritrea are in conflict, the US chose the larger and more amenable partner, Ethiopia. Then Ethiopia is provided with economic and military aid while Eritrea is punished with sanctions due to its alleged support to Somali Islamist groups. In 1996 Ethiopia and Eritrea cooperated and formed IGAD and then in 2006 Eritrea withdrew over policy differences on Somalia. Now, Ethiopia is making sure the door is blocked on Eritrea’s return to the organization (Ibid).

It also necessitates the two countries to maintain huge armies at high cost. Scarce economic resources which could have been utilized to change the lives of impoverished people are being used on wasteful military expenditure. The hundreds of thousands of Ethiopian and Eritrean soldiers’ standoff only with about 70 up to 80 meters/lines along their respective borders. Therefore, scarce resources are utilized to militarize the border and the comparative advantages of economic integration are minimized. Most worryingly, the risk of small border skirmishes that could escalate into full blown war considering the absence of a peace keeping monitory organ is a potential threat to peace (Tariku, 2016; ICG, 2008).

This stalemate has only losers, no one is winning over the other. Eritrea is affected by it due to its small size and inflexible political leadership. Its citizens are under constant military service and economic hardship because of huge military expenditure, sanctions and lack of economic investment. Even if, Ethiopia is less affected by it, there is no tangible goal to be obtained by the stalemate. However, both countries could achieve and gain extensive economic benefits by peaceful coexistence and cooperation (Ibid).

The two governments cannot settle their conflict on their own due to the fact that they cannot trust each other. That is why it becomes difficult to implement the Algiers agreement in a comprehensive manner (ICG, 2008; Informants).

## **4.2 Major Hindrances of Scholars and Intellectuals For Not Engaging Actively in the Process of Peace and Reconciliation**

The major hindrances to African intellectuals have included authoritarianism, dependence, the pettiness of state projects driven by power hunger and “self aggrandizement” (Thandika, 2005:2) As Ali presented a conference in 2004 on the role of intellectuals in the HOA, he identified political, ideological and psychological challenges that the intellectuals face and the need to overcome these in order to come up with alternative means to the fragile condition of the region. Some of the challenges are- historical explanation on the origins of people based on myths which was used to claim political legitimacy, hegemony and domination, the inheritance of “zero sum mentality” which viewed cultural, religious, ethnic distinctions as primordial contradictions and not oblige to compromise, “the obsession with territory” which decreases the relations and interests of people in the region to engage in territorial claims and counter claims and authoritarian power control and political culture which claims power from God or history not from the people (Ali, 2004).

The following are some of the major hindrances that the scholars and intellectuals face for not participating actively in peace and reconciliation activities in the Ethio-Eritrea conflict. Of course, the list is not exhaustive.

### **4.2.1 Division and Blaming One Another**

The criticism has been of how ‘state-centric’ African intellectuals have been, i.e. their inclination to view the state as the motivational force of social change and development or to define themselves only in relationship to the state. Although such state-centrism can result in ‘entryism’, the view that one can influence the state by assuming some functions within it, this need not be the case. They have thus failed to create and manage the instruments of a genuine autonomy that might have ensured a participatory involvement with society commensurate with its stature (Thandika, 2005:35). The country’s intellectuals have been known to invade the political scene as idols or ideologues, technocrats or experts, critics or censors (Ibid).

According to Mamdani (1993:318) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) intellectuals have always needed opposition to or collaboration with the regimes as reference points and yardsticks for their own performance. For some these raised serious questions throughout Africa’s post-colonial history,

the opportunism, unflappable sycophancy and trenchant collaboration have allowed authoritarianism to become entrenched (Thandika, 2005:35).

Most of my informants argued that the intellectuals are separated or divided between opposition groups and government sides which create major obstacles to engage themselves in finding peaceful solutions to the Ethio-Eritrea conflict. Most of the time writings are also divided among these two lines. One of the scholars among the informant insisted that the scholars who are supports of the regimes do not take the risk of offending their own governments. Those who are in opposition of the governments are not taken seriously by the two regimes. One of my informants argued that the intellectuals continue to put the blame on one another and wrote articles just to “win”. Most of the informants agreed that not all intellectuals have profound knowledge on political issues, political problems and historical happenings. It is also true for some of the political leaders. In other words some of them lack political plat forms. This is because their perspectives on national issues, international relations are almost the same with their governments and much less with ordinary people.

Ethiopia has no shortage of intellectuals in the field of political science, international relations, international law and other pertinent field of studies. However, many are divided and active in writing opinion pieces and producing papers on domestic issues, there is silence when it comes to Ethiopia’s geopolitical interests (Haile, 2015).

#### **4.2.2 Supporting Governments**

What most governments wanted was not critical support but subservience and “sycophancy”. Generally African intellectuals have accepted their social responsibility and in most cases have also accepted both the nation-building and “developmentalist” projects espoused by the political class. Too many African intellectuals allowed themselves to be subject to power and to accept the injunction that ‘silence: we are developing’. One key determinant of both the conditions for the flourishing of intellectuals and the autonomy of the spaces in which they have operated has been the state. The African states have posed a serious dilemma for African intellectuals, at once seductive and threatening. On the one hand, its strengthening has always been necessary both for safeguarding the sovereignty of the new states and for steering the nation-building project. And it is insisted that intellectual endeavour be nationally relevant (Thandika, 2005:2-3).

As Amina Mama (n.d.) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) clearly pointed out it is easy to see that ‘national relevance’ remained un-problematized, and insensitive to the fact that African nations are deeply characterized by class, ethnicity, gender, religion and other dimensions of difference and inequality. Intellectuals are crucial to the emergence of a new culture, representing the world-view of an emerging class or people.

Gaim (2009) stated that instead of taking stand for peace, almost all intellectuals on Ethiopian as well as Eritrean side, civil society organizations and church organizations sided with their respective governments namely EPRDF and EPLF to celebrate the victory while there was still a fighting going on and bloodshed continues on the war scene areas. He also added that “Most Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals, we sided with our governments”. The scholars support their respective governments during the war which can be considered as both positive and negative roles. Positive in a sense that they mobilized among themselves, collected the money and contributed and fulfilled their national obligation when their countries need them most in emergency conditions. Negative in a sense that, they knew that war is devastative, hurts people and they should have mobilized for peace and lobby their governments.

Today some Eritrean intellectuals on Ethiopian condition are divided in to two. These are those who sided with the Eritrean government and those who supported the opposition groups. Supporters of the Eritrean government- still advocated the Eritrean government’s propaganda. They criticized EPRDF and they performed this task because the Eritrean government is in conflict with the Ethiopian government. For this purpose, they mentioned some problems in Ethiopia (Tsfatsion, 2011: 8).

#### **4.2.3 Absence of Trust and Agreed Strategies**

Beginning with the second half of the 1970s and until the present the amicable relationship and attitude of mutual tolerance which characterised the interface between the academicians and the state in the immediate post-independence era has soured badly and has given way to an increasingly strained relationship of suspicion, mistrust, antagonism and sterile lack of co-operation. Many governments in Africa neglected and declined to actively solicit the views and research inputs of national think-tanks, particularly as related to the primary areas of policy setting or policy prescriptions. While a number of social scientists have continued to produce

research that was relevant to policy-making purposes, such efforts have often been wilfully ignored. Where research has produced divergent views, it has usually been considered as subversive. Evidence has also indicated that even when solicited by governments, the rate of adoption of recommendations made by social scientists was dismal (Thandika, 2005).

Most of the informants argued that there is mistrust among the scholars and intellectuals. Moreover, the scholars did not trust the two government officials. There is also absence of mutually agreed peace and reconciliation strategies among scholars and intellectuals which could be developed by them concerning the future Ethio-Eritrean diplomatic, economic, political as well as people to people relation. Some scholars and intellectuals also failed to consider and recognize the separation of these two country's people as a big issue. In other words, they have failed to take "no peace, no war" situation seriously. As such the majority of the scholars and intellectuals have made little/ no effort to bring together the people of these two countries. One of the informants among the professors has pointed out that "self interests overwhelm us" which means more attention is given to the issue of border demarcation and the question of access to the port than to the mechanisms of finding ways for making peace. Nevertheless, this is not to deny the fact that there are those extraordinary scholars who devoted themselves to make peace between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. One of my informants has argued that an excellent example here is Prof. Tesfatsion Medhane who contributed a lot to the peace process and mostly concentrates on advocacy of peace and reconciliation among the peoples of these two countries.

#### **4.2.4. Lack of Initiation and Coordination**

The informants agreed that the two governments monopolized the Ethio-Eritrea conflicting issues and the scholars and intellectuals are simply marginalized. The important reason could be fear of "reprisals" from the regimes in which the majority of intellectuals are drawn in. However, the anxiety seems "perceived, ambiguous than real". There exists also lack of determination of the wider academia, they seemingly leave the case to the belligerents to address and resolve the conflict whenever they want to do so. Thus, we find small number of scholars and intellectuals who has no anxiety to reflect their views, opinions and policy alternatives. At the same time, not all intellectuals have a corridor of political issue. It is considered as it could be risky to talk about it openly and frankly. It is likely that the scholars can easily be associated with the two governments since the issue has been politicized and polarized. So, they prefer to remain quiet.

The notion of collective intellectuals is not that of a simple aggregation of individuals, but comprises of a multiplicity of individuals, unity and cohesion among them and it is by no means an easy task. It is important that South African intellectuals insist on autonomy and a critical distance from the state, even where the liberation movement's commitment to democracy was encountered with faults. Such a demand for autonomous spaces for intellectual activities may be considered as elitist, distant and self-indulgent, but these spaces are essential to any productive role for intellectuals in the new democratic South Africa (Thandika, 2005).

Most of the informants agreed on the fact that those who are independent scholars and intellectuals often present their views and findings about the conflict between the two countries and offer their suggestions, proposals about possible solutions in scholarly journals which are mostly limited to the academia. Therefore, the leadership and cohesion among themselves is too limited and the impact is also too limited. The researched papers on the Ethiopian and Eritrean conflict and mechanisms on the resolution of the conflict are not been fully recognized by political elites.

#### **4.2.5 Divergence of Perspectives/ Problems of Narration**

“Pan-Africanism” has been driven by history, geography, politics and imagination. Although intellectuals have contributed to the shaping of pan-Africanism, the complex and conflicted spatial locations and cultural situations of contributors have contributed to its connotative complexities and ambiguity. The contrasting circumstances have led to differences in perspectives and priorities (Thandika, 2005).

Some Ethiopian as well as Eritrean intellectuals were impressed by Marxism-Leninism ideology that made them to uphold “Manichean” perspectives in which most of the time also reflected in political groups. “Manichaeism” is a form of perspective which considers everything from two contradictory standing points and taken for guaranteed as an absolute truth/right (Tsfatsion, 2010).

For example black vs. white, enemy vs. friend, good vs. bad/worst and so on. In such perspective, there is only one possibility and to be with only one of them. There is no third alternative. There is no controversial issue and complicated question which creates a problem in

decision making. So, it is not possible to negotiate and reach consensus. There is no place for mutual tolerance and cooperation (Tsfatsion, 2010).

Most of the informants stressed that national discourses between Ethiopia and Eritrea do not take mutual stand. There is a problem to be neutral. Instead of taking mutual stand on national issues, Most Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals stick firmly with national ideologies. Many intellectuals lack political platforms and weakness in being honest about the situations. Most of the intellectuals sweep up/ focus on the nationalist discourses, nationalist interests and failed to recognize the existing situations concretely and put forward the alternative solutions. It is true that the intellectuals have identities and love their countries. Therefore, the first and most important problem among intellectuals is their contribution in the analysis of the Ethio-Eritrean problem. In this regard, three important issues are raised and discussed. The first is the Ethiopian interpretation of the problem which defends Ethiopian interests. The second is the Eritrean interpretation of the problem which maintains Eritrean interests. The third is the “factual indispensability” which is the critical one; accepting the historical facts on the ground and impossible to forcibly change it. That is, Eritrea was an integral part of Ethiopia then colonized by Italy, federated with Ethiopia, abrogation of federation, thirty years of armed struggle, independence in 1991 and post 1998 dynamics. These are the facts on the ground but interpreted in different and “ultra-nationalistic” ways. The intellectuals on both sides focus on national interests instead of scientifically digging out the problems on the ground. Their perspectives are much influenced by nationalistic stand points. One of my informants points out that “We need to come up with new discourse; Evidence based not emotion, not promoting hatred and polarizes”.

#### **4.2.6 Absence of Independent Scholars and intellectuals/ political Affiliation**

Most informants agree that on both sides there are very few independent scholars and intellectuals. Most are either associated either with the current regimes or with the opposition groups/ organizations within or outside the two countries. Often times it is self-interest that dictates the research and political orientations of such individuals. The intellectuals and scholars are not autonomous groups and the most influential are the state entities at-least in the context of Ethio-Eritrean conflict. There are no pressure groups. Intellectuals and scholars are somehow involved in this either way they are supports of Ethiopian government or Eritrean government because of that they cannot convene a good peace dialogues and conferences. When there are

“die hard supporters” of EPRDF and PFDJ, it is difficult to engage in peace and reconciliation campaign. In other words intellectuals are not autonomous agents. This is a big problem and unresolved challenge.

#### **4.2.7 Financial Constraints and Reflection of NGOs Interest**

Given the extremely meagre resources and limited intellectual spaces, African intellectuals have been quite productive. It is true that many of their insights were ignored or repackaged and resold as foreign technical assistance. But if the rulers did not pay attention, the blame cannot entirely be placed on the intellectuals (Thandika, 2005). The “right” type of participants— independent-minded individuals who will clearly express national perspectives and perceptions but still be open to listening to the other sides’ views—can greatly improve the prospects for track two dialogues. The problem is that such individuals—often coming from academia, think tanks, and NGOs—may have limited influence with official policymakers and are disconnected from grassroots groups or other broadly based societal movements (Kaye, 2007).

One of the informants pointed out that those who are independent scholars and intellectuals often lack the resources to organize “independent” forums and public discussions. They do not have much influence or power and organization. They are not been active in peace and reconciliation. The challenge of selling new ideas and policies back home poses a second set of obstacles to track two dialogues. Limited elite influence—no transmission of track two ideas to official policy circle (Kaye, 2007). The absence of independent publishing or distribution endowed with financial resources from non-governmental sources, and the lack of research outfits with independent financial backing, also contributed to the atomization of the intellectuals. And finally, it was suggested that, given their dependence on foreign funding, African intellectual work could not be expected to serve African interests. The imperialist funding of social science teaching, research and staff development in developing countries also imposes the same ideological and imperialist Orientation and surveillance on peripheral social science scholarship (Thandika, 2005).

One of the informants states that whenever conferences are held the scholars are involved and organized by NGOs. They are handicapped by the fact that such organizations (NGOs) are self-interest groups and reflects NGOs interests. In other words, what dictate is primarily financial

interest's not genuine stance and outlined objectives to contribute for the efforts towards peace and reconciliation between the two countries.

#### **4.2.8 Limited Intellectual Space**

From the earliest days of independence African intellectuals have clamoured for autonomous spaces for their thinking. And not many such spaces were offered by the various regimes that have reigned in much of Africa since independence. However, Amina Mama and Mazrui (2002) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) argued that the restrictive use of these spaces was due not only to the repressive apparatus of the state. Academics themselves could compromise the autonomy of the institutions or make the autonomy a source of self-imposed marginality. The mismanagement of such spaces has led to much soul-searching among African academics. Self-censorship, ethnic politics, intolerance and misogyny within such spaces are some of the problems that have been raised.

One of the informants had pointed out that in Ethiopia there are some political parties but in Eritrea there is no such thing. The political context in Eritrea as well as Ethiopia did not create suitable conditions since the issue become politicized and sensitive to have a constructive discussion. It hindered the scholars and intellectuals to use their skills in order to make the issue forward and eventually resolve it.

The EPLF political leadership is not much in-favour of intellectuals. "It is apprehensive of the dangers of enlightenment in the rank and file as it is wary of democratic upsurge and challenge from below" (Tefatsion, 1989: 53). The intellectuals are either "suppressed" and "voiceless or timid and servile" or simply "yes men careerists". They have very little or no influence of their own in political and ideological matters (Ibid: 54). Therefore, There is limited political space for the intellectuals to use their knowledge and skills to make the issue of peace achieved.

Ali (2004:160) affirmed that HOA has had more than its fair share of liberation movements and concluded by saying that what is badly needed in our region is rather a movement for the liberation of critical thought and independent mind.

He also stressed the need to develop “new intellectual and psychological approaches”, “new literary tools”, “new forms of expression”, in other words “new words and ways to understand ourselves” and “face the ugly images in the mirror of our reality”. He pointed out that,

I am also aware that it is always easier to criticize a situation and deplore the behaviors of others. It is much more difficult to formulate feasible proposals and translate them into concrete action.... The intellectual patterns in our region are the result of a certain interpretation of our history and a certain vision of our future...I am convinced that we are able to reconsider our past with different eyes and reinvest our future in a new way...We need to develop new kind of exchanges and dialogue between intellectuals of the region in order to build other interpretations of the horn of Africa that could enhance mutual understanding, solidarity and hope of change (Ibid: 160-161).

Beyond the imperative of intellectual cooperation, which compels us to revisit the mistakes of the past, the plight of our war-torn societies can no longer allow us the luxury of concentrating on issues which stir up hatred and exacerbate division. Time has come to concentrate our efforts on finding ways to facilitate a pacific and beneficial coexistence. It is time for the intellectuals to shift from ethno-centric and primordialist approaches and build an holistic approach taking properly into consideration the common aspirations of the populations, generally ignored by the circles of power holders and by the existing studies centre in the region (Ibid).

He advocated the creation of Centre of Anticipative Studies and Regional Integration in the HOA which could offer an adequate framework for researchers, opinion leaders, and policy makers to exchange their new visions. This initiative would attempt to respond to the wishes of numerous intellectuals and scholars from the region and from the Diaspora who have expressed the need of an independent “Think Tank” that could facilitate regular exchanges and debates on issues of importance for the HOA. The initiative is aiming to build a learning process among intellectuals in the exchanging of contradictory ideas without losing the sharing of common ideals (Ibid: 162-163).

## **4.3 Possible Contributions for Peace and Reconciliation**

### **4.3.1 Possible Contributions for Peace**

One of the informants clearly stipulated that Positive efforts have been made by both sides of scholars and intellectuals through some kind of holding peace conferences by neglecting the confrontational status quo of their respective states. Whereas, the prevailing political forces i.e. EPRDF versus PFDJ (formerly known as EPLF) found it difficult to make compromise on critical issues. “Animosity” is so deep between the incumbent political groups. All of my informants agree that the scholars and intellectuals contribution to make peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea has been limited.

The Scholars and Intellectuals even if they are not decision makers but they play big role particularly in developing countries. Civil society organizations have roles. The Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals play both constructive and destructive roles (Tefatsion, 2011: 2).

Most of the informants stressed that scholars and public intellectuals have been ineffectual in their influence. However, the scholars and intellectuals have a role. They can contribute individually and/or in group. It depends on political circumstances/ context. They can contribute directly by cooperating on issues and necessarily on peace and culturally and socially. Indirectly, they can contribute by providing constructive criticism and self criticism.

They also identified that the possible contributions of intellectuals and scholars towards peaceful resolution of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict are indirect. The scholars can discuss one to one and build the relationship among them as used to be and show that they can work together. This would make the two governments to come to consensus. It is also true that the relationships between Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and intellectuals are going on unless for those affiliated with EPRDF and PFDJ. Another contribution of scholars and intellectuals is to diagnose all the historical facts and critically understand the historical dynamics and structural/fundamental problems that exist between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Many scholars have contributed a lot by their useful insights as well as durable strategies of peace. It is obvious that these “prescription” for the resolution of the conflict were derived and based on deep assessment of the underlying root causes of the conflict since they devoted themselves to make peace and studied well for such a long period of time. However, there still needs to carry out and advance their studies based on

ongoing trends and geopolitical situation. The following are some of the major contributions of Scholars and intellectuals to resolve the Ethio-Eritrea conflict.

#### **4.3.1.1 Holding Conferences, Peace Dialogues and Peace Activities on Workshops**

In most soft track II diplomacy techniques such as dialogues, familiarization, exchange of information and assessment of security concerns are given due recognition.

Most track II efforts were launched with much more modest purposes in mind: to enhance communication among participants- and to provide them with settings that are more conducive than official negotiations for exploring their disagreements, understanding their different perspectives and helping to bridge the gap between their different perspectives. Indeed, even the Oslo talks were initially aimed at assisting the stalled track I negotiations in Washington rather than replacing these official discussions. Thus, it seems more appropriate to judge the success or failure of Track II talks by the purposes defined by those who convened and those who participated in these talks.<sup>5</sup>

Soft track II discussions are also directed at policy drafting (Kaye, 2009). If the track II discussions were only to identify the causes of the conflicting parties and to support in dealing with the problems entangled in the conflict, then the maximum efforts in which the identified objectives were achieved will provide reasonable criteria for judging their accomplishments. For a time being track II discussions may not guarantee perfect mutual understanding however, the absence of such discussions will for sure pave the way for further crises and unrest (Hussein Agha, Shia Feldman, Ahmed Khalidi, and Zeev Schiff, 2003).

The American Academy of Arts and Science (AAAS) organized a plenary secession consisted of US intellectuals as well as representatives from the two countries namely Israel and Palestine. Alongside Prof. Everett Mendelsohn of Harvard University and Jeffrey Boutwell representing the academy were Shibli Telhami, then Associate Professor and director of Middle East Studies at Syracuse University and Middle East expert Naomi Weinberger from Barnard College, New

---

<sup>5</sup> More on hard track II diplomacy see Hussein Agha et al (2003). Track II Diplomacy: Lessons from the Middle East. Cambridge. The MIT Press. p. 5.

York. The Israelis who participated in the discussions were Joseph Alpher, Deputy Head of Tel Aviv University, and Jaffee Centre for Strategic Studies, Major General Shlomo Gazit, a senior research associate at the Jaffee Centre and a former director of military intelligence and Zeev Schiff military editor of Ha'aretz. The Palestinians who engaged in the discussions were as follows, intellectual and security specialists Ahmed Khalidi and Yezid Sayigh, Khalil Shikaki, director of the Centre for Palestine Research and Studies in Nablus and Nizar Ammar, a Palestinian Liberation Organization(PLO) security official delegated from Tunis especially for the discussions (Ibid:59).

In addition to the main effort undertaken by the scholars and intellectuals to help participants negotiate a document addressing the security problems associated with Israel's possible withdrawal from the West Bank and Gaza, the AAAS discussions provided a setting for informal meetings among a subset of the participants: effectively a Track II within a Track II. On the Israeli side, Gazit Schiff and Alpher, on the Palestinian side Khalidi, Sayigh and Ammar attended the discussion. The AAAS hosts were aware of these discussions but did not take part in them, nor were they briefed about their contents. After each round of discussions, Gazit and Alpher reported to their colleagues, primarily at the Jaffee center. Schiff shared his impressions from these discussions verbally in meetings with Israeli leaders, including Arafat and Abu Mazin. He also prepared a series of briefing papers and circulated them within a select circle of security and political officials (Ibid: 60).

The subjects discussed in these inner track II discussions ranged beyond the specific agenda of the academy sponsored discussions. For example it was through this more intimate channel that the Israeli learned from Nizar Ammar in March 1993 that the PLO leadership was willing to consider the Gaza strip for Israel to the PLO before an agreement on the transfer of control over the west bank was to be concluded. A message to this effect was conveyed by Israeli participants to Prime Minister Rabin and allowed him to verify the information he was receiving from the Israeli's taking part in the Oslo discussions. Thus, without the knowledge of the participants involved, one track II venue reinforced the other.

From the Israeli participants' standpoint, the AAAS discussions helped to make the Palestinians more aware of the security problems that were likely to be associated with Israeli's withdrawal

from the West Bank and Gaza. The Israeli's taking part in the discussions also gained insights into how the Palestinians perceived these likely security problems (Ibid: 60-62). The Oslo discussions led to the formal peace agreement between Israelis and Palestinians (Kaye, 2009).

Later, in October 1994, they were gratified when their Palestinian counter parts were able to convey and utilize directly the lessons gained through the Academy venue: Ammar, Khalidi and Sayigh became advisors to the Palestinian delegations in the formal PLO-Israeli discussions in Cairo and Taba and participated in the initial security negotiations over the post-Oslo 'Gaza and Jericho' agreement. The professional background of the Israeli and Palestinian intellectuals and participants also aided the utility of the Academy discussions (Hussein. et al., 2003).

During the Dergue period, there had been witnessed some improvement in Ethiopia to negotiate for peace with EPLF. For instance, there had been some "liberalization" particularly in the domain of intellectual freedom, which is considered as a most welcomed development. This was clearly reflected in the presentations of Ethiopian scholars based in Addis Ababa who participated in international conferences in New York, Paris and London in 1988. Several of them included and forwarded some responsible and constructive criticism of the government's policy in various areas particularly with regard to Eritrea and went to Ethiopia. The "liberalisation" had "jolted" the EPLF organization which thus tried to deny it or to dismiss it as insignificant. The EPLF body named ADULIS, reflected this in its commentary on the free participation of the Ethiopian scholars in the Paris and London conferences. It called the scholars 'WPE [Workers Party of Ethiopia] stalwarts and government sponsored academicians from Addis Ababa' (Tesfatsion, 1989: 41).

Guaranteeing the actual exercise of intellectual freedom is important in itself. Moreover, it is an effective way of improving the image of the Ethiopian party and government. It is not only a fundamental right but in a sense also an effective means for repulsing the propaganda offensive from the contras of all hues and colours (Ibid: 42).

All of my informants have participated in various peace conferences and have different roles. Some of them contributed by writing articles on Ethio-Eritrea conflict, presenting on international workshops and the mechanisms to resolve the conflicting issues, some of them involved by organizing the conferences and still others attended the conferences as an observer and raised important issues for discussions. They were also engaged in radio and websites

discussions and debates. Peace conferences were held in Amsterdam, Netherlands; Oslo, Norway, sponsored by the government Norway and peace forums were held in Addis Ababa where both Ethiopians and Eritreans were participated. They raised many issues but yet none of them were transferred into action and meaningful efforts to achieve peace and reconciliation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The researcher selected some of them which could be considered as significant examples.

With a highly motivated and determined initiative taken by the Association of Eritrean Professionals and Academics for Development (AEPAD) to expand and strengthen the peace dialogue and relation between the nationals of Ethiopia and Eritrea, it hosted a half-day peace conference entitled, "A Search for Peace: The Eritrean-Ethiopian Conflict". The program was held on May 9<sup>th</sup>, 1999 in Arlington (Virginia), and was attended by an audience of over 200 Eritreans, Ethiopians and friends of both countries, included "thorough and candid" presentations by two Eritrean and four Ethiopian panellists. The conference was organized by Prof. Kidane Mengisteab and moderated by prof. Araya Debessay. Mr. Kassahun, one of the participants in the conference raised an important and outstanding issue that he felt had been ignored and unnoticed since the end of the armed struggle and culmination of Eritrean independence (Thomas, 1999).

The absence of any form of reconciliation between the peoples of both countries was believed to partly explain the existing rift in views and approaches to resolve the current conflict. He stressed the importance of Eritreans and Ethiopians to maintain an 'open and critical dialogue' with each other, since the fate and destiny of both countries remain inextricably linked. This would further enrich the existing links and commonality – including historic, geographic and cultural ties – among peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia (Ibid).

In closing remarks, Mr. Kassahun (1999) (as cited in Thomas, 1999) expressed his confidence that an African solution to an African problem will be ensured to the current Ethio-Eritrea conflict and hopefully to be realized in the near future.

The scholars and professionals came together in August 2004 for a conference entitled "Horn of Africa: Transforming itself from a Culture of War into a Culture of Peace" in Lund, Sweden and sponsored mainly by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Forum SYD as well as the city of Lund. The previous two conferences in 2002 and 2003 had been successful in creating

needed trust and confidence among participants to meet and discuss both difficult and painful subjects. In May 2003, Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre (SIRC) with collaboration of Horn of African scholars and Eritrean, Ethiopian, Somali and Sudanese Associations in Lund carried out a successful three day conference entitled “Horn of Africa Conference: No Development without Peace”. The conference report for 2003 was sent to numerous universities, institutions, international organizations and governments. Among these are the Horn of African governments through their embassies, IGAD, AU, UN, EU and Swedish government. They organized workshop particularly on Ethio-Eritrea case and raised important question “Is there any room for reconciliation between Ethiopia and Eritrea, If so, how?” (Svensson and Abdillahi, 2004: 14).

The participants find it difficult to identify concrete ideas for reconciliation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. They believed and stressed that a research project on the root causes of the war between the two countries with the aim to better understand how peace can be built could open up the door for an opportunity of cooperation. They stressed the importance to create an environment allowing the parties not to lose faith, and not putting the blame on one side over another. This is due to the fact that it will only provide “new seeds” of disagreement and contention. One must replace a research “for the guilty with a search for consensus”. Instead “one should open to differences of interest and opinions, but try hard to emphasize on common benefits”. They argued that the initiatives should aim at a gradual process of increasing mutual understanding with specific focus on fostering coexistence in a first phase (Ibid).

On 12 and 13 March 2007 the Centre for Policy Research and Dialogue (CPRD) and the Inter Africa Group (IAG) jointly organized a principal conference in Addis Ababa on the “Current Challenges of Peace and Security in the Horn of Africa”. The scholars and professionals’ conference findings on Ethio-Eritrea conflict were as follows;

- The conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea still continues and it has a negative impact for the peace and security of the Horn of Africa. Unless this conflict is resolved, it is difficult to exercise real progress and development in the region.

- The border dispute which led to the 1998-2000 war is the result of the ‘haphazard territorialisation of modern Africa’ emanated from the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> c colonial administration of the continent.
- The issue of access to the sea outlet and trade routes comprises historical and significant part in the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea but it is not the major causes of the war. Prof. Clapham, one of the participants in the conference clearly stated that Ethiopia became one of the most populous landlocked countries in the world as a result of its loss of control over the “red sea ports of Massawa and Assab”. However, Ethiopia’s access to these ports had been hampered beginning from 16<sup>th</sup> c and was a landlocked country for almost 4 centuries. The war between the two states was political not solely territorial. As such, it cannot merely be resolved through legal means using international laws. So it is necessary to seek other mechanisms to bring peace and go beyond the issue of demarcation of border.
- IGAD, concerned governments, civil society organizations and international community must coordinate and commit themselves to convert the Ethio-Eritrea stalemate by using creative means and intensive dialogues and negotiations.

Furthermore, the scholars and intellectuals can hold dialogues among themselves can negotiate articulate policies but cannot enforce them. They can play a role of public diplomacy/shinglana but are not committed themselves to play such role and the political leaderships seem not appreciative of this initiative at-least when it comes to Ethio-Eritrea conflict.

#### **4.3.1.2 Formulating Policies and Writing Objectively**

The intellectuals need to be objective when they write the discourse of Ethio-Eritrea. Moreover, developing relevant policies and solutions through magazines, websites, and academic scholarly journals could be great contributions. They can have further research and development of revised version of interpretation on historical relations and accounts that existed between Ethiopia and Eritrea. It is based on mutually agreed and objectively upholds analysis.

The scholars and intellectuals are writing articles on different websites practically. They can publish articles on the formation of states or the emergence of people in Eastern Africa in general and the HOA in particular so that history cannot be manipulated by political groups and tailored according to their political aspirations. Scholars can have dialogue and prepare policy papers that promote peace and reconciliation among the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. That is perhaps one of the best ways scholars can promote understanding and hopefully influence policy makers and government officials. They can also petition their governments and international and regional organizations like the UN, AU and IGAD to facilitate peacemaking and cooperation. In other words, they can be advocates for peace and trying to influence people and developing policy to support peace. Therefore, the primary roles of the intellectuals are diagnosing all the historical facts, the fundamental problems and answer the question of why these problems occurred? This is because as one informant argued “the problems happen not simply because of the totalitarian/dictatorial nature of the regimes or ultra-nationalistic perspectives of Eritrean state”. The historical dynamics were not critically analysed. So, the intellectuals need to critically understand historical and structural dynamics. Diagnosing the Ethiopian interpretation, the Eritrean interpretation of the problems, the historical dynamics of Ethio-Eritrea relation and eventually reach where the problems lies.

#### **4.3.1.3 Educating People and Intellectuals about Peace/ Advocacy of Peace**

This peace activity also involves truth telling and lobbying the people to mobilize for peace. It is aimed to shift public discourse towards peace (UNDP, 2014). It was astonishingly conducted by Prof. Gaim Kibreab at the London Peace Conference from December 19-20, 2009 entitled “The Justification for an Eritrean Peace Movement”. At this peace conference he educated people or to his colleague scholars about peace and conducted peace advocacy role. He said,

... If u look at the Ethiopian-Eritrean border war..., over 70,000 lives were lost, I drayed to think of the number who were maimed ...none of the two governments is willing to reveal how many they were...the border between the two countries was more secure, more stable before the two countries went to war,...and the reason why the border is more insecure and unstable today...because borders can never be created through violence. Borders historically have always been the result of dialogue, understanding and unless borders are mutually accepted and are demarcated in-terms that are acceptable to both sides, they can never be stable and no country no matter how mighty, how powerful it is

can never impose on its neighbouring countries, it may be able to remove its weaker neighbouring state from contested territories but it can never establish stable boundaries or borders by force...Before the border war broke out in 1998, people, animals, goods moved freely between the two countries...African borders were created artificially and the border communities never recognized those artificial boundaries, their livelihood systems were actually based on economic resources that were located on both sides of the borders and they always moved freely. For states borders are points of separation but for border communities, borders are points of contact, connection, understanding and soon. So one of the most damaging consequences of border war has been the destruction of livelihood systems...

He continued to express personal experience in Ethiopia on a UN mission as an Eritrean citizen who at one time stayed and charged with 50 birr at Hilton hotel where as his European friends paid \$200. He then proceeded with the significances of non-violent means of conflict resolution.

...One of the saddest thing that remain in the memory of our forth coming generations is that I don't know what they are to think of us our generation when they hear that over 70,000 lives were lost over a place called badme ...talking about peace ask soul-searching questions and it has to start with our own selves. We have to renounce our past positions and in the future the aim of this initiative is that we should be able to say no to violence, violence does not solve any problem and therefore we will not be part of it. It is a high time therefore that we draw lessons from our past follies not only our government's follies but our own follies too and we really need to commit ourselves that you cannot solve a political crisis or a conflict through violent means. Violence breeds violence...We should instead embrace the non-violent method of peaceful campaigning...

This effort could be supplemented by Mobilization for peace rather than for war- this could be done in-order to demilitarize and demobilize the militarized border areas through organization of petitions and non-violent action.

#### **4.3.1.4 Developing Bright Vision and Implementation Mechanisms**

There was a great deal of self-criticism among intellectuals. For some this self-criticism called for a re-engagement with society in the light of lessons learned; some were left unfazed by criticism and simply chose to serve whoever was in power or had money; still others withdrew into a kind of “self-preoccupation and navel-gazing”. The question of the relevance, appropriateness and meaningfulness of what they were producing touched a nerve among African scholars and was ‘a source of considerable soul searching among the social science community’. One was the oppositional stance of most African intellectuals and their

unwillingness to be ‘usable’ by some of the unsavoury regimes that littered the African continent (Thandika, 2005).

Some Ethiopian as well as Eritrean intellectuals feel down morally and declined. They can develop a bright vision, strategies for its implementation and in the mean time the trust among them will flourish and optimism will enhance and strengthened. “Our history, the world condition will force us to collaborate; our people have shown for the intellectuals their strong brotherly relations” (Tsfatsion, 2011:12).

#### **4.3.2 Possible Contributions for Reconciliation**

##### **4.3.2.1 Re-Constructing Common Ethiopian and Eritrean History**

Ochada (n.d.) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) argued that the nationalist historiography was meant to correct the “one-sidedness” and “racist historiography” that served the colonial ideological apparatus. Colonial historiography denied African agency and was essentially an account of the explorers, traders, merchants, missionaries and colonizers. Deconstructing this view and placing Africans at the centre-stage in the history of their continent was perceived as an urgent task in the construction of an intellectual advantage for the liberation of the country and the decolonization of the mind. In the process, this analysis often becomes victim to the sins committed by colonial historiography – the sins of one-sidedness and idealization. The Africa that emerged out of this history was both “ahistorical” and “asocial”. ahistorical in the sense that it talked only of a glorious past uninterrupted by conflict and reversal and asocial in the sense that it failed to deal with the social contradictions that drive all social history. Hannington Ochwada (n.d.) (as cited in Thandika, 2005) insisted on the importance of African history in forging the new ‘renaissance’ and reconstituting a new personality not on the basis of an idealized and un-problematized past but on a full understanding of the complex heritage and historical happenings (Thandika, 2005).

In relation to the question of integration between Ethiopia and Eritrea there is misunderstanding of historical interpretation. With this misunderstanding and “struggle”, there are weaknesses and mistakes from all sides which grew up from “Manichean” perspectives (Tsfatsion, 2010:7).

Reconstructing common history is a necessary mechanism for reconciliation purposes between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. Shared history could also be an incentive for cooperation and facilitate for the generation of culture of peace. However, it is of crucial significance to underscore that this also presupposes the recognition and acceptance of “equality of histories”. The “constructionist history of the hegemonic state” is confronted by another “constructionist local history”. The difference is constructivism of local history is compelled to begin by the act of deconstruction – of the hegemonic narrative (Ethiopian narrative) and construct a new local history which is to be positioned in parallel with the “hegemonic history”. In the case of the Eritrean history, it rests on the claims and legitimization of the legacy of colonial history. Eritrean history, as it was narrated by Eritrean nationalism was the result of a genesis of colonial (Italian) history. The histories of the peoples in the reconstruction process are the common assets of the peoples of the region as such provide a currency for the prospective culture of peace (Redie, 2004). According to Redie (2010) the root causes of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict resides on “claims and counter claims i.e. contested pre-colonial, colonial and post colonial histories” (Redie, 2010:19).

Most of the informants suggested that writing non-nationalist history or professional not biased histories or more simply reconstructing historical facts could contribute in resolving the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea and in the process of reconciliation. One of my informant among the professors stressed that, it needs “serious and detailed assessment of the root-causes, processes and outcomes of the Eritrean question in the context of Ethiopian history”. Much has been written on Ethio-Eritrean history by independent scholars such as Christopher Clapham, John Markakis, Tekeste Negash and others. Most of my informants argued that the “new generation” with “new mentality” has a responsibility to write unbiased history and clear the distorted facts. The 1960s generation were influenced by ideology particularly “Marxism” which was a source of knowledge. Those who reject other’s ideology were seen as “enemy”. Other informants argued that after some peace is achieved between Ethiopia and Eritrea then they can sit and write common history on the basis of “Regional narrative”. Who writes Eritrean history? How they interpret it? There are historical contradictions on the history of Ethiopia and Eritrea. There is an Ethiopian interpretation of three thousand years history based on an ancient historical analysis where as Eritrean nationalist’s colonial thesis history is not more than one hundred years. There were historical happenings such as the *wuchale* agreement, the battle of Adwa, the

Addis Ababa agreement, the (1900, 1902,1908) agreements with Italy, the emergence of Italian colonialism in Eritrea, 1941 the defeat of Italy and establishment of mandate system under the control of Britain, 1952 federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia, 1962 the abrogation of Federation, 1991 independence of Eritrea, 1998-2000 the war between the two countries, the most important and the last issue is the border decision which legalises all the historical processes. These are all historical dynamics but were not critically analyzed.

#### **4.3.2.2 Efforts in the Promotion of Peace and Reconciliation**

This is conducted for several years by two extraordinary and determined scholars namely Prof. Tesfatsion Medhanie and Prof. Daniel Kendie. Moreover, Prof. Tekeste Negash with a profound and unique idea of Ethiopian and Eritrean unity promoting as a way for restoring reconciliation among the two countries population (Tecola, 2011). The regional organizations including AU and IGAD can make serious efforts to encourage a policy of reconciliation and cooperation. The educated elites i.e. the scholars and intellectuals of both countries including professional and civic organizations to break the silence and spearhead a movement aimed at reconciliation and mutual accommodation. The beginning can consist of modest and well-thought out programs of confidence building measures. This can be followed by more elaborate programs of study and research focused on common resource endowments and public meetings to discuss such programs. Cultural exchanges and arrangements of friendly sports tournaments should serve as lubricants to facilitate the process. There are enough evidences of such exchanges and friendly sporting events going back to the recent past (Bereket, 2011). Reconciliation committee was established by Dr. Mesgina Gebremedhin and with some of his friends and actively engaged in such activities and reiterated the need to integrate such forum as they can bring about better understanding between the people (Abiy, 2014).

#### **4.3.2.3 Effective Role Models**

Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars particularly intellectuals have special responsibility by being role models in establishing and advancing mutual deep understanding and cooperation. They have to know each other very well. First, Eritreans must know the long history of Ethiopia which is also their history. This knowledge of history clearly shows and will help to create and strengthen the fraternal relationship exist between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. The Ethiopians must

know and understand the part of history which led to the suffering of Eritreans. Eritrean intellectuals need to minimize the presentation of Eritreans as being victims and oppressed and begin on depicting those Eritreans who lived in Ethiopia before 1991 as they were respected/privileged persons, were Ministers, Generals, attorney generals, wealthy people, successful traders, etc. They were not colonized people (Tefatsion, 2010:12-14).

Ethiopian intellectuals also need to minimize their saying of Eritreans were separated from us and begin to move to understand the pain of Eritreans. For example, How Eritrea became an integral part of Ethiopia, the consequences of the abrogation of the federal arrangement, why the Eritrean question had different dimension which makes it distinct from other regions of Ethiopia. They can witness that Eritreans were not only respected, appointed and respected but they also contributed a lot for the development of Ethiopia in all spheres. This type of intellectuals' role is necessary for the relationship of Ethiopia and Eritrea. It can also have big contribution for the future integration of Ethiopia and Eritrea (Tefatsion, 2010: 14).

#### **4.4 Peace Strategies**

It is hard to expect that the problem of Ethio-Eritrea conflict will dissolve away itself with time. The peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia have suffered not only loss of life and property in the war, but also time and resources, and similar loss should not be allowed. Peace does not come with the signing of agreements and silence of the guns, or with a decisive military victory, or with delimitation and demarcation of a boundary, or even with overthrow of governments. Peace has to be desired and worked at. Durable peace comes by tackling the root causes of conflicts and the hindrances and problems to peace with care, wisdom, and sustained political will and commitment. It is a long process (Zemenfes, 2004). Several Eritrean scholars and intellectuals are in favour of abiding by the Algiers Agreement means upholding the sanctity of colonial boundaries as a means of resolving the conflict since boundaries are directly related to the sensitive issues of territory and sovereignty (Daniel and Paulos, 2011b; Redie, 2010; Zemenfes, 2004). Depoliticising border issues, the boundary lines imposed by colonial powers, are considered as arbitrary and artificial lines that split same cultural groups into different states, and hence incompatible with geographical distribution of ethnic groups and/or traditional power structures. The boundary lines are artificial in the sense that they are imaginary lines imposed on

geographical space by men (Zemenfes, 2004). Some of the informants stressed that collaboration and joint administration is necessary on contested territories since the societies who live along the border lines know every detail very well.

#### **4.4.1 Pressure from the International Community**

Since May 1998 the international community has expended a great deal of time, energy, money and political capital on the Ethio-Eritrea issue (Healy, 2007). The international community should not allow another war to erupt and resolve the Ethio-Eritrea conflict. Both governments firmly stick with their stances on conflicting issues. First, the conflicting parties themselves have proved impervious to persuasion. This is largely a matter of the political culture that they share, deepened by years of guerrilla struggle, in which compromise is equated with “capitulation”. This was exacerbated by past mistrust and antagonism between the two ruling parties. There is not a great deal that the outside world can do about this, but it does make diplomacy much harder on them (Ibid). In 2009 the Belgian representative stated that the border conflict remained unresolved because UNMEE was unable to implement its mandate. Eritrea restricted the movement of UNMEE which forced its withdrawal and at the same time Ethiopia refused to collaborate to implement the decision of EEBC (“Repertoire,” 2008-2009).

Most of the informants are convinced that under such circumstances the two governments can neither negotiate nor settle and normalize their relations without third party intervention. There exists deep “animosity” between the prevailing political forces. That means there is no political will between these two groups to settle their conflicts in a peaceful manner.

The disappearance of EEBC removed an important forum where even if they disagreed the two parties exchanged views regularly before a third party arbitrator (ICG, 2008). The international community’s engagement is important and influences to put a lot of pressure on the two governments to negotiate and reach a common ground for peaceful and mutually accepted solutions. They can also provide incentives. These could also be done through acting as neutral facilitators. Therefore, the condition of the current “Cold Peace” and in order to break such a stalemate it is necessary for the two governments to begin an honest conversation within the framework of the Hague decision and with the intervention and help of the UN, the AU and

perhaps the EU. They can establish a new mechanism to contain the circumstances and construct a new strategy that tackles the deeper issues blocking peace (ICG, 2008; informants).

#### **4.4.2 Confidence Building Measures**

The role of NGOs is significant for peace making and allowed to play their constructive roles free of the interfering hands of governments (Zemenfes, 2004). Stop interfering in the internal affairs of the other and supporting opposition groups based on the principle of ‘my enemy’s enemy is my friend’ (Redie, 2013). One of the informant clearly stipulated that Peace cannot be obtained from tension, thus first governments has to take confidence building measures. At least they must refrain from acting of delegitimizing each other. Then people-to-people relations have already been started informally. They can work on this to cultivate and enhance. The government of Ethiopia must encourage and involve individuals particularly scholars, NGOs and others to generate meaningful peace plan. But such strategies need to be developed in the open discussion and through consecutive dialogues. At the end, Ethiopia can shape its future relation with Eritrea.

#### **4.4.3 Consciousness and Consensus on Port Assab**

The question of port is a big issue. It is considered as a national security issue. One of my informants among the professors has said that “port Assab has lost its economic values and becomes a political issue”. It is agreed by both Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars that Port Assab was an Ethiopian port 25 years ago. However, after the independence of Eritrea, it is found on an Eritrean sovereign state. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Ethiopia cannot have the historic right to access the port. Now, Port Assab is found in the sovereign territory of Eritrea. Ethiopia wants to have a guaranteed access to the port. Long term agreement on port Assab for Ethiopia and Eritrea to utilize it on equal terms but recognizing the fact that Eritrea has a sovereign right over its port Assab can solve issues related to the question of port.

## CHAPTER-FIVE

### 5. Achievements and Failures

#### 5.1 Achievements

The first step in conducting “socialization” process is to emphasize that the dialogue itself is important as a means to better understand the other participants’ positions (e.g., perceptions, Policies, red-lines). Because of the informal and off-the-record nature of track two dialogues, the participants are provided an opportunity to engage in frank discussion and explain the rationale for various policies (as opposed to just repeating public rhetorical positions). Another aspect of “socialization” is the educational value of such dialogues, which discuss in depth substantive concepts. Such opportunities for exchange can improve the parties’ understanding of each other’s perceptions. An Egyptian security analyst learned through dialogues what was important to Israelis, which encouraged him to begin an Arab-Israeli Peace movement among intellectuals. An additional aspect of the socialization stage is the building of knowledge and regional expertise in a particular issue area. The informal and academic atmosphere allows participants to engage in more creative, flexible, and long-term thinking than is possible in official forums. The value and role of track II diplomacy, underscored this dynamic, with many of the participants speaking of the process as if it were a club that needed to be preserved and strengthened (Kaye, 2007).

The informants clearly depicted that the people to people and in a similar manner scholar to scholar interaction in conferences have some impact in promoting mutual understanding, even though the impact of such contacts and exchanges may not be seen quickly. Intellectual to intellectual relation between Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars is still going on with-out any obstacles unless for those affiliated with political groups. Developing a shared sense of the problems faced by all parties and a common analytic framework by which to address them can give regional parties more confidence that a solution to their conflict is possible.

Series of conferences held with regard to Ethio-Eritrea conflict identified and dealt with many interlinked issues. They were informative and educational. They helped to increase awareness on raised issues. Facilitating conferences and seminars of Ethiopian and Eritrean in the metropolitan

centres of the world could also be used to shift the “dilemmas and entanglements” of the issues (Tariku, 2014).

## **5.2 Failures**

Currently, the relation between Ethiopia and Eritrea is not peaceful let alone mutually co operational. The intellectuals had contributed during the separation period of the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea and their afterward contributions could be dealt by further negligence (Tesfatsion, 2010). The contributing factors for playing such roles, Prof. Tesfatsion (2011) raised the following three important questions and identified some of the most noticed weaknesses on both Eritrean and Ethiopian intellectuals.

What are the roles of intellectuals during the Eritrean armed struggle for separation?

What are the major problems in playing such roles?

What are the roles of intellectuals after the separation of Eritrea from Ethiopia?

The intellectuals of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, both Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals had enormous roles. These generations of intellectuals was praised for their efforts to study and deeply understand historical facts and political ideologies. However, they failed to show it practically. These generations presented itself for “protests and revolutions”. Only a small group seriously followed their education and engaged in political struggle. They had a “bright vision” and “novel wish” for both Ethiopia and Eritrea. They cared for their people and stand for their country and ready for sacrifice. Nevertheless, they lacked well developed knowledge and understanding that can meet with the established “greater” vision. This is a grand failure. These generations both in Ethiopia and Eritrea was well known for the love that they have for their country and revolutionary ideas but failed to have strategies to materialize their vision. The intellectuals did not have deep knowledge with regard to Ethiopia and Eritrea (Tesfatsion, 2011:1-6).

Eritrean intellectuals did not have deep knowledge on Ethiopian history and politics as well as on Eritrean history and politics. The Ethiopian intellectuals did not have much knowledge about Eritrea. These generations of intellectuals failed to give due recognition for history and culture.

They associated history and culture with feudalism and dissociate their significance. They failed to understand our country's culture in political sphere which was characterized by using force and violence. In our society peace and love are core values. However, political history had reflections of brutality and harshness. In our history, i.e. Ethiopian and Eritrean history one king is replaced by another king not through peaceful means but through so much bloodshed. The intellectuals were born and raised with in the society and adopted the society's culture and values but exposed to modern education. The intellectuals failed to acknowledge that they shared essential values with the societies. These generations of intellectuals both in Ethiopia and Eritrea did not had "civility". The way these intellectuals expressed their perspectives in most times were not in stable and open manner but through radical and violent means. These generations of intellectuals failed to work together, mutually understand each other and cooperate closely (Ibid).

Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals particularly during the Dergue period contributed their own part for the creation of the current problem. They are still playing their destructive roles to exacerbate the existing problems. Their contributions were and still are connected with their respective government's policies (Ibid).

### **5.3 Eritrean Intellectuals during the Dergue Period**

#### **5.3.1 Instruments of EPLF and 'Great Powers' Agenda**

Eritrean intellectuals who live abroad were not playing the creative and constructive roles expected of them. Most were leading quiet a life and unconcerned with the issue of restoring peace in Eritrea. Most were irresponsible and others were "uncritically applauding" the policies and programs of the EPLF armed political group. It was pitiful to watch such intellectuals simply echoed the EPLF 'line' of argument and functioned as "sycophants" of the EPLF leadership (Tesfasion, 1989). Those who were supporters of EPLF showed the greatest failure. They failed to have intellectual autonomy and freedom. They were used as an instrument by EPLF. They wrote articles and books which were mostly a reflection of EPLF's views and perspectives, advocated EPLF's propaganda. On the contrary, those associated with ELF had a small amount of autonomy.

During the cold war the Ethio-Eritrean question were interlinked with the big powers competition. The US led bloc of western powers supported EPLF and other opposition groups

against the Dergue regime led by Mengistu which was supported by the Soviet bloc. Some Eritrean intellectuals who were supporters and members of EPLF shaped and presented the Eritrean question that can be convenient and used for western strategy, echoed and advocated (Tesfatsion, 2011:6-8).

### **5.3.2 Historical and Sociological Mistake**

Eritrean intellectuals made the greatest mistake and caused damage. They presented a falsified version of history. They claimed that Eritrea was never had any political and administrative relations with Ethiopia. They misinterpreted facts and had taken the Eritrean youth under a huge confusion with regard to its identity. They performed these activities to show that Eritrea is a different country and in order to have autonomous right and eventually to be a sovereign state. However, they had not supposed to write a distorted version of history in order to argue for Eritrea's right of self-rule. To the worst, the intellectuals promoted the notion that "Eritrea was colonized by Ethiopia". This is a big mistake. Eritrea's autonomy was overtaken by force and incorporated as another region. This was violation of right but not similar with the condition of colonialism. This narration was being used in order to support the separatist argument and groups. It served in order to misguide the youth. This distorted version of history was not supposed to be presented as such and not necessary to advance Eritrea cause for its independence (Ibid).

Some of them were rushed in distorting "historical and sociological" truth. They constructed "contriving ideas" and denied historical and other forms of relationships existed between the peoples of Ethiopia and Eritrea. A few intellectuals had gone to the extreme side and portrayed Eritreans as being "ethnically distant" to the people of the northern region of Ethiopia including to the Amharas and even to the Tigreans (Tesfatsion, 1989). Some Eritrean intellectuals played a role and presented Ethiopians including Tigrean people's culture as "underdeveloped", "backward", "uncivilized" and "barbaric". This role still continues especially with regard to the Tigrean people. They depicted Eritrea's capacity in an exaggerated manner and are practically EPLF's spokespersons. They participated in promoting Eritrea as the one who has hardworking people, self-reliant, miraculous country and in the future it will be like the developed Asian countries (Tesfatsion, 2011; Desta, 2009). These acts confused many Eritreans and created obstacles in the process of integration and cooperation with acceptance among fellow Ethiopians.

It helped in order to cut the ties between the people of the two countries. It created problems (Tsefatsion, 2011).

### **5.3.3 Truth Telling**

Now, some of the Eritrean intellectuals still are not performing their significant role of truth telling in educating their own people. For instance until now the EPLF propaganda is the brutality committed against the Eritrean people during Emperor Haile Selassie and Derge period. During the armed struggle EPLF also committed brutality against the Ethiopian soldiers. The intellectuals failed to mention this fact. The Eritrean people have to know and understand this. The intellectuals have this responsibility but they are not willing to conduct. They failed to differentiate/ to make a clear distinction between the Ethiopian people and their government.

They failed to announce that the Ethiopian people are always ready to integrate with Eritrean people. The Ethiopian people accepted Eritrean people as his/her own brother and ready to integrate in different sectors through different mechanisms. Now, some Eritrean intellectuals praising the Ethiopian people and performing such function is an excellent move towards achieving peace and reconciliation (Ibid).

## **5.4 Ethiopian Intellectuals**

### **5.4.1 Portraying Ethiopia and Eritrea as one Nation**

Most Ethiopian intellectuals focused on the previous and current status of Ethiopia and Eritrea as one nation state. They said that Eritrea was part of Ethiopia and through some mechanism Eritrea should be part and parcel of Ethiopia again. They mentioned historical relation that existed starting from Aksumite period. Some Eritrean intellectuals also agreed to this fact that Eritrea was part of Ethiopia starting from the Aksumite civilization period. The problem of Ethiopian intellectuals lies in their argument that emanates from historical facts that Eritrea will not have any right to secede from Ethiopia. The Eritreans should know that there existed historical relation between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The Ethiopians on their part must understand that the historical linkages existed between Ethiopia and Eritrea but it should not to be forced up to unification. It is true that Ethiopia and the greater part of Eritrea were one country. Even though, “we do not like it and not proud of it”, Eritrea starting from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c that is for almost 50 years was under Italian colonial administration which was also taken as another part of

history. After the end of Italian colonial rule, Federation system of administration was created and abrogated which is also another history. These historical happenings have their own roles and left with their own problems and ramifications which needs to be agreed and resolved (Ibid: 8-11).

#### **5.4.2 Linkages with PFDJ**

Some Ethiopian intellectuals have taken smooth stance and seek support from the Eritrean government in their endeavour to overthrow the EPRDF regime. It comes from their hatred to the current Ethiopian government. They even considered Pres. Isaias as the one who is committed for the unification of Ethiopia and sometimes depicted him as the one who needs federal arrangement between the two countries. These intellectuals are the exact copy of those Eritrean intellectuals who supported Ethiopian government. Some Ethiopian intellectuals presented EPRDF particularly TPLF as an instrument of the Eritrean government and stand for the advantage of the Eritrean people not necessarily at the expense of the Ethiopian people. Nevertheless, this is incorrect (Ibid).

#### **5.4.3 Argumentation Regarding Port Assab**

Some Ethiopian intellectuals similar with the stance of the Dergue regime propagated and advanced their stance which is a threat to Eritrean territorial integration. The Dergue regime in 1987 had proclaimed a declaration which would divide Eritrea into two separate self administered regions and tried to dismantle the integration of Eritrea. Some Ethiopian intellectuals argued Assab and the surrounding areas should be given to Ethiopia (Ibid; Desta, 2009). This will threaten the territorial integration of Eritrea. “The Ethiopian intellectuals must respect the territorial integrity and unification of Eritrea. The same goes to Eritrean intellectuals who needs to respect the territorial integrity and unification of Ethiopia” (Tsfatsion, 2011: 10). Hence, the responsibility which is also roles performed by both countries’ intellectuals is mutual recognition and acceptance of one another’s existence for peace to prevail and for reconciliation to prosper between the two countries.

Thus, the argument of Assab and the surrounding areas to be delivered to Ethiopia in other way means for many Eritreans, what we need from Eritrea is port Assab and not cooperation with Eritrean people in any mechanism. This argument is very difficult and clashes with the strong

stance of many Ethiopian intellectuals who mainly advocated the historical relationship between Ethiopia and Eritrea. This is such a great obstacle and the Ethiopian intellectuals must clearly understand it (Ibid).

#### **5.4.4 Unable to Accept and Acknowledge Eritrea**

Most Ethiopians including intellectuals find it difficult to accept and acknowledge Eritrea as a sovereign nation state. The basis of this problem comes from the way the process of referendum was carried out and handled. It is true that the referendum was not been carried out in a civilized and mutually agreed manner. However, now Eritrea is separated from Ethiopia and become a sovereign nation state. Neglecting or refusing to accept this reality is unpractical and may instigate another round of devastating war. So, such argument is dangerous and would not be of help to resolve the conflict (Ibid).

For instance one Ethiopian scholar insisted that “I do not acknowledge the independence of — ‘Eritrea’ either as moral or legal act. I think of it as a surrogate occupation of my land by hostile historic enemies of my Ethiopian (Black) original land and territory and the alienation of my kin and civilization” (Tecola, 2011:7). Nevertheless, Most of my informants agreed and accept the independence and sovereign status of Eritrea even though they still feel resentful about the separation of Ethiopia and Eritrea into two political entities.

The Ethiopian intellectuals although their criticism and un-satisfaction about the referendum is correct but they needs to accept this fact. When they began accepting Eritrea as a sovereign nation state then they can create deep understanding and collaboration with Eritreans and contribute a great deal for the integration of the two countries (Tesfatsion, 2011: 11).

#### **5.4.5 Remedy Measures In Order to Overcome Weaknesses**

The solutions as directed by Prof. Tesfatsion (2011: 11-12) for the above outlined problems could be resolved by applying the following measures. Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals have to study their previous failures and find out the major reasons for negative contributions; “moral and psychological”. When investigating their failures then they can sincerely and patiently contribute in the efforts towards resolving the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea by carefully analyzing problems and issues. They can take responsibility to contribute by searching

integration mechanisms in the cooperation process between Ethiopia and Eritrea. Since the world push the two countries to integration so such task is a necessary obligation. In order to perform these activities; the following are the sufficient preconditions;

- A. The establishment of Ethiopian and Eritrean dialogue conferences.
- B. In these conferences they can learn each other by raising and sharing issues related to Ethiopia and Eritrea. They can make constructive criticism and enhance mentally and psychologically on mutual basis with regard to contested issues.
- C. They can also communicate frequently, know each other and build up their trust and confidence. This trust and confidence is significant for the initial linkage and eventual collaboration of Ethiopia and Eritrea.
- D. In these conferences, they can discuss issues related to political ideologies necessary for the integration purposes such as confederation, federation as well as related cultural and social issues. Thus, those Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals who need to strengthen the integration of these two neighbouring countries must work hard for cooperation.

Ethiopian intellectuals need to minimize their emphasis on domestic politics and ethnic differences aside for the sake of the country's common long term interests, and focus on conducting research, share their opinions and publish their papers in influential print and online media with the objective of promoting Ethiopia's national and security interests (Haile, 2015).

### **5.5 Integration Mechanisms among the Population of Ethiopia and Eritrea**

The societies of the HOA are intimately connected with each other in terms of culture and natural resources. The availability of a range of natural resource endowments, on the one hand, the histories and cultures binding them, on the other, are premises on which the societies of the HOA would be able to build a culture of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. Ethiopia is the largest country of the Horn demographically, and largest geographically. The remaining Somalia, Eritrea and Djibouti follow respectively in the scale of size. Ethiopia, on the other hand, possesses a fertile agricultural land, especially in the southern parts of the country. Provided

there is sufficient rainfall and a proper use of its rivers, it also can be self-sufficient and exporter of agricultural products. Its population size provides great potential for considerable market. Eritrea used to export cash agricultural products but it was destroyed during the armed struggle for liberation. It has prospects of mineral resources and ports (Redie, 2004).

Ethiopia and Eritrea related geographically, historically and culturally. Creating mutual benefits economically will strengthen harmonious neighborhoodness between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. Strong neighbourhood relation takes economic and political form. Economically united and politically through confederation (Tsfatsion, 2009). One of my informant stressed that there is a need between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea for peace and cooperation. When the two peoples are directly involved in determining their own respective destinies, then they can achieve cooperation.

In this period of globalization, countries in the world are interconnected through different sectors. Ethiopia and Eritrea are two developing countries, they have to integrate and cooperate among themselves. Under today's world circumstance, Ethiopia and Eritrea needs to integrate economically as well as politically. The political integration between Ethiopia and Eritrea is confederation if and only if certain pre-conditions are available. Confederation is necessary to integrate not only between Ethiopia and Eritrea but the whole of the HOA. The integration between Ethiopia and Eritrea is crucial and serves as a bridge to integrate the HOA (Tsfatsion, 2009). Creating mutual benefits economically will strengthen harmonious neighbourhood relations between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea. Confederation means the establishment of mutual government by integration through legal means between two or more countries by respecting their sovereign status. For example, EU is the strong cooperation among member countries on mutual foreign policy, mutual defence policy, mutual security policy, mutual court system, mutual currency, mutual commissions, and so on. Ethiopian and Eritrean confederation could be strong integration on various spheres (Ibid).

## **5.6 Indigenous and/or Modern Conflict Resolution**

Indigenous African conflict resolution system involves healing social relationships, designated from African history and culture. The research findings of political scientists in local politics are unquestionably important. A good example is the usage of "*ubuntu*" in South Africa's

reconciliation efforts (Mensah, 2008). Most of the informants agree that both conflict resolution methods are important to resolve the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The modern conflict resolution method is important to solve the political problems and reach conclusive agreement. However, the broken relationship between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea only can be deal through indigenous approaches. Cultivate the common culture and build up on ancient heritage and overcome minor political differences are crucial for resolving the conflict. The people have a lot in common, a lot to share; historical and cultural linkages and they can work together and create harmony. The cultures do not have any place for conflict and tolerate violence.

The people as well as the intellectuals and scholars come from the “most virtuous societies”. In fact they are the core part of society but as a result of the recent history, they to a certain extent brutalized and never been endowed with responsible governments and it is usually states that perpetuate conflicts. This is because of lack of democratic institutions, developed NGOs. The states character tends to influence quite the larger number of population in the HOA (Gaim, 2009). Thus, they can cultivate on good values and move forward.

## CHAPTER SIX

### Summary and Concluding Remarks

The preceding chapters discussed the role of scholars and intellectuals in relation to peaceful resolution of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict. The outcomes of the existing condition of no peace no war stalemate in economic, social, political circumstances are assessed in a critical manner.

In examining the possible contributions of scholars and intellectuals in the efforts for peace and reconciliation vis-à-vis the factors that creates obstacles for not engaging effectively in dealing with Ethio-Eritrea conflict. Employing different concepts and theories of conflict resolution, peace and reconciliation assessed the early engagement of scholars and intellectuals both from Ethiopian and Eritrean side. The scholars and intellectuals are influential groups and play critical roles, even if they are not decision makers in the context of the developing countries. They are also considered as middle level leaders who can influence both state officials and the people at large. Peace activities through holding dialogues and conferences, advocating for peace, establishing reconciliation commission were conducted by different scholars in different places. Taking the good initiatives and peace activities of them, it is possible to avoid the outbreak of another devastative war and build on peaceful relations. Much emphasis is needed and be given on the settlement of issues related to the root causes of the conflict.

It is taken into account that most of the conferences held by scholars and intellectuals in the search for peace between the two countries concentrated on the production of scholarly works and analysing the conflict instead of finding a more comprehensive and sustainable peace and reconciliation mechanisms. Indeed, the scholars and intellectuals engage themselves in extensive academic works such as conducting research, writing books, articles and journals and it is of course such spectacular contributions.

Assessment of peace conferences and dialogues held in the process of resolving the issues entangled in the Ethio-Eritrea conflict. This short chapter provides a concise summary and conclusion of the study. It should be reiterated however that the issues and factors affecting the Ethio-Eritrea conflict/no-peace no war situation is complicated but if it taken seriously there can be a way out. The issues entangled in the conflict are not yet been seriously considered and

studied well. One of the obstacles is ‘final and binding’ agreement making it difficult to reach at all conclusive agreement that captures the complexity and the deep mistrust between the two government officials. Those scholars who devoted themselves for the peaceful resolution of the conflict are exemplary cases that Ethiopian and Eritreans can sit down and have a constructive discussion but it needs support from both governments. Such initiatives need to be encouraged and recognized at least for the sake of making peace.

The major hindrances for the limited involvement of scholars and intellectuals emanates from division among themselves in line with government and opposition sides, lack of initiation and coordination, political affiliation, financial constraints associated with reflection of NGOs interests, lack of intellectual space and so on. The possible contributions for peace by different professors which could be made by other scholars and intellectuals are holding conferences, peace dialogues, peace activities, and their afterward findings and recommendations, advocating for peace. The attempt in reconciliation can start from rewriting the common history of Ethiopia and Eritrea and making a document, then by being effective role models for young generations and so forth.

The previous achievements made by scholars and intellectuals are creating awareness, mutual understanding and discussing the sensitive issues in a bold and constructive manner. Past and present mistakes/mismanagement which can be considered as failures in-terms of their destructive role in writing the history of Ethiopia and Eritrea, being an instrument for advocating the propaganda of armed opposition groups, depiction of falsified version of sociological linkages, concentrating on merely victimization part of story, unable to acknowledge Ethiopia and Eritrea as two sovereign states(view as one nation state), argument on port Assab to be given for Ethiopia instead of mutual utilization, not taking mutual stand on national issues and focusing on only ones national interest which is usually charged with ‘ultra-nationalistic’ perspectives.

On the one hand, the two governments still firmly stick with their stance on border issue that is why resolving the conflict among them needs pressure from international community, it necessitates harsh diplomatic measures as unmatched peace strategy. On the other hand, the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea are bounded by historical and cultural ties. This makes it easy for an integration of the people of these two countries.

## Recommendations

On the basis of the research conducted with different scholars and intellectuals of Ethiopian and Eritrean origin, the researcher would like to make the following recommendations:

- Reconstructing the common history and preparing a document of Ethiopian and Eritrean history. Creation of Psychological and mutual understanding among the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea.
- Establishment of Ethio-Eritrea studies unit like the one in Germany, Italy and Djibouti in which peace conferences and dialogues will be held, encouraging frank discussions as a start up in Ethiopia. This is due to the fact that some of the scholars and intellectuals studied well and knows perfectly the resolution mechanisms.
- Intellectual Autonomy and space is a necessary precondition for engaging in peace process. They studied the problem for such a long period of time and should be given due credit. If a genuine peace is needed the two governments or at-least the Ethiopian government must approach the scholars and search for mechanisms for peaceful resolution of the conflict.
- Ethio-Eritrea conflict must end once and for all because the people suffered a lot because of the war. Like the mobilization that had been seen for “Badme” war on both sides, there needs mobilization for peace because no peace no war situation is equated with fragile peace and one day it may erupt into full blown war. There should be promotion of mutual respect and tolerance.
- The border issue should be depoliticized and port Assab must regain its economic values for mutual utilization and benefit of both countries. In order to bring about peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea, it needs decisive and progressive efforts both from the international community and educated elites of both nationals.
- Collaboration among Ethiopian and Eritrean intellectuals by setting aside their political differences is the necessary precondition to actively engage and resolve the conflict.

## References

- Abiy Solomon. (2014, November 14). Conference calls for consolidated people to people relationship of Ethiopia, Eritrea. Hahudaily. Available at: [Hahudaily.com/2014/11/14/conference-calls-for-consolidated-people-to-people-relationship-of-ethiopia-eritrea/](http://Hahudaily.com/2014/11/14/conference-calls-for-consolidated-people-to-people-relationship-of-ethiopia-eritrea/).
- Ali Moussa Iye. (2004). Developing a New Vision for our Region. [A paper presented in Svensson, Nicklas and Abdillahi Jama] *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself from a Culture of War into Culture of Peace*. Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre (SIRC), Report 3, 27-29 August. Lund: Sweden. Pp. 159-165.
- Bahru Zewde. (2002a). *A History of Modern Ethiopia, 1855-199*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Oxford: James Curry. pp.103- 111.
- Bahru Zewde. (2002b). *Pioneers of Change in Ethiopia: the Reformist Intellectuals of the Early 20<sup>th</sup> C*. Oxford: James Curry. Pp. 202- 206.
- Barney, D.D. (1994). The Role of Intellectuals in Contemporary Society. *Trans/forms: Insurgent Voices in Education. Vol.1(No.1)*. P.89.
- Bar-Simon-Tov, Yaacov (eds.), (2004). *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation: Introduction, Why Reconciliation*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp.3-5.
- Bar- Tal, Daniel & Bennink, H. Gemma (2004). The Nature of Reconciliation as an Outcome and as a Process. In Yaacov Bar-Simon-Tov (ed.), (2004). *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 11-34.
- Bercovitch, J., Kremenyuk. V.& Zartman. I. W. (Eds.). (2009). Introduction: the nature of conflict and conflict resolution. In *The Sage handbook of conflict Resolution*. London: Sage. Pp. 3-7.
- Bereket Habte Selassie. (2006). Dreams that turned to Nightmare: The Ethio-Eritrea war of 1998-2000 and its Aftermath. In Leenco Lata (ed.), *The Search for Peace: the Conflict between*

- Ethiopia and Eritrea*, proceedings of the scholarly conference on Ethiopia – Eritrea conflict, 6-7 July. Oslo: Norway. p. 28.
- Bereket Habte Selassie. (2011). *Wounded nation: How a once promising Eritrea was betrayed and its future compromised*. Trenton: The Red sea press. Pp. 151, 183-190.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London: Sage. P.19.
- Daniel R. Mekonnen and Paulos Tesfagiorgis. (2011a). The Causes and Consequences of the Eritrean-Ethiopian border conflict: The need for a holistic approach towards transitional justice. In Roba Sharamo and Berouk Mesfin (eds.), *Regional Security in the post-Cold War Horn of Africa* [Monograph, 178]. Institute for Security Studies. p. 83.
- Daniel R. Mekonnen and Paulos Tesfagiorgis. (2011b, July 23). *Eritrea-Ethiopia: the Algiers peace agreement and its aftermath*. Available at: <http://www.Asmarino.com/articles/1113-eritrea-ethiopia-the-algiers-peace-agreement-and-its-aftermath>.
- Desta Dadeyom. (2009). *Little Spoken Facts, Untried Solutions: Revisiting the Ethio-Eritrean Conflict*. Available at: [http://aigaforum.com/articles/little spoken facts](http://aigaforum.com/articles/little%20spoken%20facts).
- Eliaeson, Sven and Kalleberg, Ragnvald (Eds.). (2008). *Academics as Public Intellectuals*. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars. Pp.1-5.
- Ethiopian and Eritrean Friendship Forum (EEFF): 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Friendship Conference. (2012, February 29). “Ethiopia& Eritrea: Healing past wounds- Building bridges together for a brighter future”. Press release. San Jose: California.
- Fisher, J. Ronald. (2009). Interactive Conflict Resolution: Dialogue, Conflict Analysis, and Problem-solving. In Dennis. J.D. Sandole, Sean Byrne and et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. London: Routledge. pp. 329-331.
- Fleck, Christian. Hess, Andreas and Lyon, E. Stina. (Eds.). (2009). *Intellectuals and their Publics: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*. Burlington: Ashgate. pp. 1-4.

- Getahun Seifu. (2012).Ethiopian- Eritrean Conflict: Options for African Union Intervention. In Managing Peace and Security in Africa: *Essays on Approaches to Interventions in African Conflicts, selected cases in Africa*. The Africa Peace and Security Programme. Institute for Peace and Security Studies (IPSS). Addis Ababa University. Pp.145-146.
- Graf, Wilfried, Kramer,Gudrun and Nicolescou, Augustin (2007). Counselling and Training for Conflict Transformation and Peace-Building: the Transcend Approach. In Charles Webel and Johan Galtung (eds.), *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. London: Routledge.Pp.124-126.
- Haile Tessema. (2015). *On Eritrea, Lesson for Ethiopia from Russia–Ukraine Relations*. Horn Affairs English. Available at: [hornaffairs.com/en/2015/12/29/Ethiopia-eritrea-threats-lesson-russia-ukrain/](http://hornaffairs.com/en/2015/12/29/Ethiopia-eritrea-threats-lesson-russia-ukrain/).
- Healy, Sally. (2013). IGAD and Regional Security in the Horn. In James J. Hentz, *Handbook of African Security*. London: Routledge. p.221.
- Healy, Sally and Plaut, Martin. (2007). *Ethiopia and Eritrea: Allergic to Persuasion*. Africa Program. Chatham house. P.8.
- Hizkias Assefa. (2004). *Peace and Reconciliation as a Paradigm: A Philosophy of Peace and its Implications on Conflict, Governance, and Economic Growth in Africa*. NP. P. 4.
- Hussein Agha, Shia Feldman, Ahmed Khalidi, and Zeev Schiff .(2003). *Track II Diplomacy: Lessons from the Middle East*. Cambridge: The MIT Press. pp. 4-8, 59-61.
- InterAfrica Group (IAG) & Centre for Policy Research and Dialogue (CPRD). (2007). *Conference on the current peace and security challenges in the Horn of Africa*. March 12-13. Addis Ababa: Ethiopia. Pp. ii-iv.
- International Crisis Group (ICG). (2003, September 24). *Ethiopia and Eritrea: War or Peace?* Report no 68.p.2-3.
- International Crisis Group (ICG). (2008, June 17). *Beyond the Fragile Peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea: Averting New War*. Report No. 147 . p. 2.

- International Crisis Group (ICG). (2013, August 6). *Ethiopia: Prospects of Peace in Ogaden*. Report No.207. P.10.
- In Quest for a Culture of Peace in the IGAD Region: The Role of Intellectuals and Scholars*. (2006). Nairobi: Heinrich Boll Foundation. Pp. vii-1.
- Jeong, Ho-Won. (2010). *Conflict Management and Resolution, an Introduction*. London: Routledge. Pp.192-217.
- Kalewongel Minale. (2008). *Ethiopia and Eritrea: the Quest for Peace and Normalizations*, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Tromsø, Norway. p.27.
- Kaye, Dalia. (2007). *Talking to the enemy: Track Two Diplomacy in the Middle East and South Asia*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation. Pp. 53-63.
- Kidanu Atinafu. (2014). Ethio-Eritrean Post Secession Hostility: Lessons for Sudan and South Sudan. *Inter. J. Polit.Sci.Develop*. Vol. 2 (No.11). Pp. 314-327.
- Kidanu Atinafu and Endalcachew Bayeh. (2015).The Ethio-Eritrean Post-War Stalemate: An Assessment on the Causes and Prospects. *Humanities and Social Sciences*. Vol. 3 (No. 2). pp. 96-101.
- Kidist Mulugeta. (2011). The Ethiopian-Eritrean War of 1998–2000: An Analysis of its Causes, Course, Impacts and Prospects. In Roba Sharamo and Berouk Mesfin (eds.), *Regional Security in the post-Cold War Horn of Africa* [Monograph, 178]. Institute for Security Studies. pp. 44-55.
- Lederach, P. John. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace. Pp. 39-51.
- Leenco Lata (Ed.). (2006). Introduction, in Leenco Lata (ed.), *The Search for Peace: the Conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea*, proceedings of the scholarly conference on Ethiopia – Eritrea conflict.6-7 July. Oslo: Norway. Pp.7-14.

- Leenco Lata. (2006). The Causes, Mediation and Settlement of the Ethio-Eritrea Conflict. In Leenco Lata.(Ed.). *The Search for Peace: the Conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea*, proceedings of the scholarly conference on Ethiopia – Eritrea conflict. 6-7 July. Oslo: Norway. pp. 74-75.
- Little, David (Ed.). (2007). *Peace Makers in Action: Profiles of Religion in Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Pp.164- 176.
- Mac Ginty, Roger. (2008). *No War No Peace: the Rejuvenation of the Stalled Peace Process and Peace Accords*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. p.18.
- Mensah, Ben. (2008). *African Conflict “Medicine” An Emerging Paradigm Shift in African Conflict Resolution?”* In Terrence Lyons and Gilbert M. Khadiagala (eds.), *Conflict Management and African Politics: Ripeness, Bargaining, and Mediation*. London: Routledge. Pp. 136-139.
- Michael, John. (2000). *Anxious Intellectuals: Academic Professionals, Public Intellectuals and Enlightenment Values*. London: Duke University Press. pp. 1-11.
- Mohammed Kheir. (2011, October 2). The G13 ‘Berlin Manifesto’: 10 Years After. Part 1 article on Awate. Available at: <http://awate.com/the-g13-‘berlin-manifesto’10-years-after-part-i/>.
- Olufemi A. Akinola. (2007). Politics and Identity Construction in Eritrean Studies, C. 1970-1991: The Making of Voix Erythre. *African Study Monographs*. Vol. 28 (No.2). pp. 47-86.
- Opris, I., Lavinia. (2012). Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea (1991-2009) - Interactions from Neo-Realist Perspective.*Romanian Review of International Studies*. Vol. 4 (No. 2). P. 60.
- Peace and Development Centre (PDC). (2016). A Brief History of the Peace and Development Centre (PDC). Available at: [pdcethiopia.org/index.php/who-we-are/our-history](http://pdcethiopia.org/index.php/who-we-are/our-history).
- Redie Bereketeab. (2004). Building a Culture of Peace in the Horn of Africa. [A paper presented in Svensson, Nicklas and Abdillahi Jama] *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself from a*

- Culture of War into Culture of Peace*. Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre (SIRC), Report 3, 27-29 August. Lund: Sweden. Pp.64-69.
- Redie Bereketeab. (2010).The Complex Roots of the Second Eritrea-Ethiopia War: Re-examining the Causes. *African Journal of International Affairs*. Vol.13 (Numbers 1&2) .pp.15-59.
- Redie Bereketeab. (2013). *The Horn of Africa: Intra-state and Inter-state Conflicts and Security*. London: Pluto Press and Nordic Africa Institute. pp. 16-18.
- Repertoire of the practice of the Security Council (2008- 2009). The Situation between Eritrea and Ethiopia. S/PRST/2009/35. PP.3-4.
- Richmond, Oliver. P. (2008). *Peace in International Relations*. New York: Routledge. p. 12.
- Sandhu, Angie. (2007). *Intellectuals and the People*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 1-9.
- Scott, A. (1997). *Between Autonomy and Responsibility: Max Weber on Scholars, Academicians and Intellectuals*. In Jennings. J and Kemp-Welch. A (eds.), *Intellectuals in Politics: From the Dreyfus Affair to Salman Rushdie*. London: Routledge. pp. 45-65.
- Seyuom Tesfay. (2012). Eritrea- Ethiopia Arbitration: A ‘Cure’ Based on neither Diagnosis nor Prognosis. *Mizan law review*. Vol.6 (No.2). p.190. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/mlr.v6i2.1>.
- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)*. (2015, June 25). *Definition of Terms*. Canada. Available at:[www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding](http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding).
- Svensson, Nicklas and Abdillahi Jama. (2004). *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself from a Culture of War into Culture of Peace*. Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre (SIRC, Report 3). Lund: Sweden.p.14.
- Tariku Debretsion. (2016, April 19). The Ethiopia Eritrea No war No Peace Situation has to End. *Institute of Development and Education for Africa*. Available at: [http://www.africanidea.org/Ethiopia\\_Eritrea\\_no-war\\_peace.htm](http://www.africanidea.org/Ethiopia_Eritrea_no-war_peace.htm).

- Tecola W. Hagos. (2011). Disillusionment of International Law and National Survival. [Paper submitted for The Third Annual Ethiopian and Eritrean Friendship Conference] “Ethiopia & Eritrea: Healing Past Wounds and Building Strong People-To-People Relationships”. March 26. San Jose: California. pp. 5-7.
- Tekeste Negash and Tronvoll, Kjetil. (2000). *Brothers at War: Making Sense of the Eritrean-Ethiopian War*. Oxford: James Curry. Pp. 5-9.
- Tesfatsion Medhanie. (1986). *Eritrea: Dynamics of a National Question*. Amsterdam: B.R.GRUNER. pp. 6-14.
- Tesfatsion Medhanie. (1989). *Peace Dialogue on Eritrea: Prospects and Problems Today*. Amesterdam: B.R. GRUNER. Pp. 36-54.
- Thandika Mkandawire. (Ed.). (2005). *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development*. New York: CODESRILA and Zed books. Pp. 1-46.
- Thewodros Aregay. (2014). *Eritrea’s Human Rights and Foreign Policy Issues in the Aftermath of the Post-Independence Conflict with Ethiopia*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Addis Ababa University. Pp.55- 83.
- Thomas Mebrahtu. (1999, May, 13). *Civic Peace Discussions gain momentum as Eritreans and Ethiopians ‘Search for Peace’*. Visafric News. Available at: <http://www.visafric.com/news.htm>.
- UNDP. (2014). *Supporting Insider Mediation: Strengthening Resilience to Conflict and Turbulence*. Guidance Note. Pp.8-9.
- Wallensteen, Peter. (2002). *Understanding Conflict Resolution: War, Peace and Global System*, London: Sage. pp. 8-13.
- Whittaker, David. J. (1999). *Conflict and Reconciliation in the Contemporary World*. London: Routledge.p.1.

Zemenfes Tsige. (2004). Eritrea and Ethiopia After the Algiers Agreement. [A paper presented in Svensson, Nicklas and Abdillahi Jama]. *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself from a Culture of War into Culture of Peace*. Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre (SIRC, Report 3). Lund: Sweden. pp. 180-184.

### **Video Speech**

Prof. Gaim Kibreab. (2009, December 19- 20). The Justification for an Eritrean Peace Movement. London Peace Conference [video file]. Available at: <https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=5WOYmrlKlkO&fulldescription=1&gl=US&hl=en&client=mv-google>.

### **Conference Proceedings**

Tesfatsion Medhanie. (2009: March 15). “*Ethiopia Ena Eritrea Keyet Wedet?*”. Bremen University. German. Ethiopia and Eritrea Friendship Forum. San Jose: California. Pp.1-11.

Tesfatsion Medhanie. (2010: March 12-14). “*Dekemetoch Ena Sehetetoch: Ye Ethiopia Ena Eritrea Yemewahad Hidet Chegroch Ena Yahunu Huneta*”. Bremen University. German. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Ethiopia and Eritrea Friendship Forum. San Jose: California. pp. 1-14.

Tesfatsion Medhanie. (2011: June 13). “*Ye Ethiopia Ena Ye Eritrea Zemedena Ena Ye Mehuranu Mina: Endet Neber? Ahunes Min Mehone Alebet?*” Bremen University. German. *Hagerehen Ena Tarikehen Eweq Werehawi Medrek*. Berlin: German Pp. 1-12.

## **Appendix 1**

### **SIRC Report 3: Horn of Africa**

#### **Statement**

**Minister Counsellor Nuria Mohammed**

**The Embassy of the Federal**

**Democratic Republic of Ethiopia**

**Sweden**

It is an honour and privilege to be able to participate in this Annual conference that has won the appreciation of the governments of our sub region, the civil society and the development partners. This platform, I believe, is one of its kinds, rarely available for us to discuss issues of mutual concern, lay the foundation for sustainable peace and forge ahead with genuine political and economic cooperation in our sub region.

The theme of this year's conference - the culture of peace versus war - is more relevant for a region that has become synonymous with devastating interstate and intra-state conflicts and influx of refugees. Confronted with renewed armed conflicts and rapidly escalating human and material costs, our task is twofold.

As a matter of priority we must strengthen our capacity to provide immediate humanitarian support to the victims of these fratricidal conflicts and ensure their active participation in the reconstruction of their respective communities.

As part of the above stated efforts we must also devise more effective strategies to prevent conflicts or any other activities that could undermine the peace and stability in our sub region. One of the best means of preventing conflicts is through the promotion and building of culture of peace. Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. In the constitution of UNESCO, in which our respective countries are a party, is stated as follows: “ ... A culture of peace is a set of values and attitudes, modes of

behavior and way of life that reflect violence by tackling their root causes – solve problems through dialogue and negotiations among individuals and group...”. We have to deal with all internationally recognized barriers of peace, especially with those that bear relevance to the realities of our sub region. Stereotype prejudice and hate that are fueled by ignorance need to be addressed through conscious local, national and regional programs. Poverty and all forms of economic and social marginalization, the root causes of conflicts, deserve our collective and individual attention.

The culture of peace requires concrete actions. We need to give serious consideration to the seven programs of action identified in 1999 by the international community:

- Fostering a culture of peace through education.
- Promoting sustainable economic and social development.
- Promoting respect for all human rights.
- Ensuring equality between women and men.
- Fostering democratic participation.
- Advancing understanding, tolerance and solidarity.
- Supporting participatory communication and the free flow of information and

Knowledge. As members of a sub region that has witnessed a number of interstate and intra-state conflicts we need to have a vanguard role in the promotion of international peace. Active participation in international efforts of prevention and resolution of conflicts as well as post-conflict peace building and peacemaking efforts is of paramount importance. It is against the backdrop of the cardinal principles, which I briefly stated above, that the people and Government of Ethiopia would like the present peace challenges faced by the countries of our sub region to be resolved. We have campaigned in a major way for peace both at regional and sub regional forums, as peace in our country is inextricably linked with peace in the Horn of Africa and the African continent as a whole. Ethiopia has been one of the few countries elected for a three years term to the Peace and Security Council set up by the African Union. Ethiopian defense forces are participating as part of the African Union multinational peacekeeping mission of the continent in Burundi and Liberia. Thousands of our soldiers are engaged in the exemplary task of post-conflict peace building activities. As front line state and member of the Peace Facilitation

Committee we are actively participating in the Somalia and Sudan peace processes. Recently the peace process for Somalia has achieved significant momentum as Ethiopia, Djibouti and Kenya have recently taken a strong common position in issues relating to peace in Somalia. Ethiopia as a front line state, directly affected, will continue to discharge its responsibilities until the brotherly people of Somalia achieves lasting peace.

We, however, would like to strongly underline that restoring peace and stability in Somalia is the primary responsibility of the people and the political forces of this country. The role of the IGAD member countries and the members of the International Partners' Forum is to give the necessary support to the constructive engagement of the political organizations, the civil society, the elders of the community. Each and every member of the society that has stake in the peace process needs to throw their weight on the forces that attempt to derail it.

The third phase in which we find the Somali peace process to date involves the formation of government and the constitution of the national parliament. At this juncture, it is source of great satisfaction to the people and Government of Ethiopia to see the formation of Somalia Transitional Federal Parliament. I hope our brothers and sisters in Somalia will live up to their responsibility by strictly implementing the spirit and letter of the Nairobi Agreement in its entirety. Similarly, we have actively participated in the IGAD Committee to bring to an end the Sudanese war that has ravaged the country for generations. We used the opportunity at our disposal due to our good contacts with both sides to the conflict to support the peace process. The people and government of Ethiopia will stand by both sides and with the brotherly people of Sudan and do all that is possible to implement the peace agreement. Similarly, the challenge faced by the people and government of Sudan in Darfur requires serious attention.

The hope for lasting peace that we have witnessed in south Sudan should not be overshadowed by the recent crisis in Darfur. The government of Sudan together with the African Union is working hard to put in place a mechanism to address the humanitarian crisis unfolding in the region and to find a political solution to the problem. This concrete action taken by the people and government of Sudan deserves the support of the international community and we members of the sub region. Ethiopia recognizes the role of enhanced and protracted cooperation with all its

neighbors in ensuring sustainable peace and this lofty objective occupies an important position in the recently elaborated Foreign Affairs and National Security Policy and Strategy of Ethiopia.

Considerable grounds have been covered to improve good neighborly relations with the countries with whom we have common borders. In this regard our relations with Sudan have shown significant progress from year to year. The agreement reached to undertake bilateral trade free from customs and duties has contributed to strengthening the economic relations side by side with the dramatic improvement of the political relations.

In the same vein significant work has been accomplished to strengthen the longstanding friendly relations with Djibouti. Joint plans have been prepared to improve the rail link, install a new broadband telecommunication service and to link the two countries with power lines. Currently the plans are found at different levels of implementation. We shall continue to work hard to maintain and deepen these relations. Our relations with Kenya are historical and longstanding. We have established mechanisms to deal with issues of common interest. Our close consultation and cooperation regarding the Somali and Sudanese peace processes, our efforts to jointly deal with the security problems around the common borders and our joint undertaking to link the two countries with a sustainable road are illustrative of the good neighborly relations.

Despite our longstanding historical and cultural ties with the people of Eritrea, Ethiopia's relation with this country has not shown any positive development. From the outset Ethiopia did its utmost to bring about a peaceful solution through diplomatic means to the conflict triggered by the aggression committed by Eritrea.

The first international initiative - the USA/Rwanda Facilitators' Mission - called on Eritrea to withdraw from the territories it had occupied and on the restoration of the previous administration. The OAU Heads of State Mission reached the same conclusions. These subsequently formed the bases for the OAU's Framework Agreement. In both cases Ethiopia accepted the recommendations while Eritrea rejected them.

It is in the face of the intransigence of the Eritrean Government and consequent failure of all diplomatic efforts to bring about a peaceful resolution to the crisis that Ethiopia was compelled to exercise its right of self-defense and restore its sovereignty.

The Algiers Agreement of December 2000 was then the direct result of Ethiopia's successful reversal of aggression, rather than the success of international diplomatic efforts, which had been obstructed by the unyielding position of the Eritrean Government. Ethiopia signed the Algiers Agreement and went without hesitation to the implementation of its different components because of its unwavering commitment of securing lasting peace with the fraternal people of Eritrea.

However, the Border Commission established in the light of the Algiers Agreement and the body given the major task of making lasting peace a reality, has not lived up to its responsibility. The Border Commission's decision on the demarcation is fatally flawed, principally because no ground survey was carried out. The Commission did not pay a single visit to the border areas, did not even undertake helicopter flights, and made no effort to consult the people and communities affected by the Border Commission's decision.

In so doing the Border Commission is negating its April 2002 decision, which clearly stated that the coordinates were provisional pending verification. In its observations of March 2003 it stated that there would be no verification process and the implementation of the boundary decision line would proceed immediately. This directive completely contradicts the Commission's decision of April 2002. The verification process cannot be disregarded. It is a breach of contract by the Commission. It is an illegal and flawed directive. The Commission itself has admitted that the implementation of a mechanically drawn line would lead to "serious problems and anomalies" and "manifestly impractical situations". Practically speaking, it would lead to fractured and split communities and the displacement of people from settlements that in some areas date back several centuries.

A botched boundary demarcation process will defeat the whole objective of the Algiers Agreement, which was to bring about durable peace and stability, leading to normalization of relations. Both countries need peace, but peace will not be brought about through a boundary demarcation process, which creates pockets of bitterness and resentment along the common border, which places "time bombs" among communities along the border that could erupt at any time and unravel the whole peace process. Whether or not it is final and binding, implementing the EEBC's intended demarcation as it is cannot lead to the establishment of durable peace and

normalization of relations between Ethiopia and Eritrea. It can only defeat the object and purpose of the Algiers Agreement.

Ethiopia's commitment to peace, since the events of May 1998, has never faltered and this has been demonstrated by Ethiopia's readiness to accept the calls of the UN Security Council for dialogue. We accepted the mission of the UN Secretary General's Special Envoy, Mr. Lloyd Axworthy, and the proposed mission of the AU, to be led by its current Chairman. In sharp contrast to this the Eritrean Government remains opposed to dialogue and diplomatic efforts and has refused to accept either the UN or AU missions. This constitutes a flagrant violation of the Algiers Agreement, which in its very first Article enjoins the two parties to "refrain from the threat or use of force against the other".

Ethiopia's position to the flawed boundary demarcation process springs from its commitment to peace, which cannot be built on uprooted and divided communities. Durable peace between

Ethiopia and Eritrea cannot rest on communities that feel let down and wronged by those who mindlessly and with little sense of justice decide to split villages and even homesteads but rather requires, inter alia, a border arrived at through an examination of the geographical and human realities on the ground, and a border both communities can live with, in peace.

Demarcation is not a matter of drawing a mechanical line, but a comprehensive task of laying the ground for lasting peace between the two countries in general and the communities living along the common border in particular.

In the light of the dismal failure of the Commission and where it has become more part of the problem rather than part of the solution, the need for comprehensive dialogue between the parties is a must as has been the case elsewhere in the continent. In this regard the experience of Nigeria and the Cameroon is a case in point that must be emulated.

In the face of the peace that has eluded the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea, we are calling on the international community and on the countries of the sub region to give their full support to our efforts to bring about a lasting and comprehensive solution to the dispute, in accordance with the Algiers Agreement and thus prevent a situation that would create interminable chaos and

instability in our region. Your support and understanding is critical for durable peace in the region and for averting the planting of seed of future discord between Ethiopia and Eritrea.

## **SIRC Report 3: Horn of Africa**

### **Statement**

**H.E. Ambassador Araya Desta**

**Embassy of the State of Eritrea**

### **Sweden**

It gives me a pleasure and indeed a privilege to be among you today at this superbly organized conference that has in the last two days discussed in depth the important phenomenon of "Culture of Peace VS Culture of War" concentrating on Horn of Africa. May I also be allowed to join the previous speakers and express my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Abdillahi Jama, Chairman of the Somali International Rehabilitation Centre, his group and Mr. Larry Andow, Mayor of Lund City for hosting this enlightening Conference, for their fantastic hospitality and for the warm reception bestowed to us. With a population of more than 100 million, it is a true fact that the Horn of Africa is a region of immense importance to the international community. It covers Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan. Other Nile Valley countries such as Kenya and Uganda are also inseparably linked to the Horn in many aspects. However, the Horn of Africa is situated in a highly sensitive zone that could significantly facilitate or disrupt global logistics and commerce.

The cold war era was characterized by the denial of civil and political rights to the people of the developing countries in the world including the people of the Horn Africa. Their fundamental rights to freely determine their political status and pursue their economic, social and cultural development were undermined. Although, the end of the cold war was expected to bring peace, stability, prosperity and conflict resolutions, we still witness heated conflicts, genocide, and destabilization of societies and governments.

The Horn problems aggravated by lack of development, heavy foreign debts, border conflicts and civil wars have become the source of the largest number of refugees, internal displacement of population, drought, famine and disease. Since the countries of the Horn are related geographically, historically and demographically a lot could have been done to improve the

quality of life for the population of the region and its tarnished image. The solutions are inter-linked, if not identical.

On the contrary, previous devastating wars and continuing tensions among the countries in the Horn continue to wreak havoc on the region's economy restraining international investments and commerce.

On several occasions, it is stated that earlier colonial and subsequent Cold War politics were major contributors to the institutional structures that led to the violence. However, external influences have created major havoc in the past, and still are the main neighbor constraints.

Somalia was a victim of such external interferences. Many parties were actually complicating the Somali crisis to further their own interests and ambitions. Since 1991, Eritrea has exerted and still is exerting diplomatic efforts unilaterally and within the framework of the IGAD organization as well as the African Union (former OAU) for a realistic and workable solution to the Somali crisis. It is the sole belief and conviction of the

State of Eritrea that the Somali crisis should be resolved by none, but the Somali people. The Somalis are the only ones capable of solving their problems and for sure they can narrow down their differences provided external interferences are curtailed. The role of the friendly and/or brotherly parties and others should be limited to assist them in creating favourable and conducive environment for the people of Somalia to resolve their crisis.

Mr Bethwel Kiplagat, Kenya's special envoy to the peace talks that have been going on in Nairobi, said the ceremony of last Sunday was the beginning of the end of a journey towards a strong, united, peaceful and democratic Somalia.

We hope this national reconciliation will lead Somalia out of its present crisis and open doors of peace, stability and prosperity before its people. In the case of Sudan, Eritrea has always been supporting developments that would help bring a comprehensive peace in the Sudan, as that is interrelated to our national interest and security. We played a big role in the peace talks with SPLM in Kenya. We have our good will to the agreement and Eritrea is hopeful for its implementation. However, it can't be taken as a final solution to the problem in the Sudan. All other problems should be addressed and addressed accordingly with sincerity for an everlasting

peace in the Sudan and the region in general. The strategic relations that we have with the Sudanese people have always been friendly and normal. Hence, a comprehensive political solution is a pre-requisite for a viable peace, stability, healthy neighborhood and prosperity. To live peacefully with your neighbor means to have peace in your home. This is a matter of principle.

It has been over two years, since the EEBC gave its final and binding verdict on the Eritrea-Ethiopia border dispute. Since then, the UN Security Council, the United States and the European Union have on several occasions, reminded and passed resolutions demanding that Ethiopia accept and unequivocally and immediately implement the decision of the EEBC.

The international community has also repeatedly demanded the regime in Ethiopia to accept its legal obligations and respect the treaties it has signed in Algiers and abide by the final and binding nature of the Hague decision.

Indeed, the regime in Ethiopia is unique and alone in its refusal to abide by the findings of the Boundary Commission and to the resolutions of the UNSC. Eritrea has met all its obligations to the EEBC and is ready to implement the decision so that peace and stability could prevail in the region.

It is on record that Ethiopia accepted the verdict on the first day the decision was announced in The Hague and called it a victory of 'law and order' against 'the rule of the jungle'. The Foreign Minister of Ethiopia in his address on that day appealed to the international community to use its influence to pressure Eritrea to accept the verdict and extended his admiration to the members of the EEBC. As a sign of its acceptance to the verdict the regime in Ethiopia asked its people to sermonize and rally on the streets of Addis Ababa. When the EEBC confirmed that Badme, the origin site of the conflict, lies beyond the border line on the side of Eritrea, the regime in Ethiopia reversed its stand and was not shy to openly reject the same decision it formally accepted as final and binding.

It is not new for Eritrea to make a note of, in any dialogue for resolution of the border conflict, that the Ethiopian leaders would first jump and declare acceptance of any proposal, and immediately change their mind once they learn that Eritrea agrees to it. The case of the Technical

Arrangements brokered by OAU in 1999 was a good example. The refusal and outright rejection to the EEBC decision by the regime in Ethiopia was, therefore, not a surprise to Eritrea.

The official letter sent to the UN Secretary General by the Ethiopian Prime Minister of Ethiopia on 19th September 2003 (a year and half after the decision) requested for a new "mechanism" to deal with the demarcation of the contested areas.

However, creating a substitute "mechanism" will have no legality and cannot be acceptable. The decision of the boundary Commission is final and binding in accordance with the Agreements signed in Algiers in the presence of the UN, USA, EU and AU (then OAU). A closed file cannot, legally, be reopened for discussion or renegotiation. The implementation of the Boundary Commission's decision is the sole mandate of the Boundary Commission. It cannot thus be substituted by an alternative mechanism. The details of demarcation, from aerial photographs to specifications of the pillars, have been worked out fully. The time frame and modalities were also worked out in detail. Thus, there can't be a new task or issue for discussion regarding demarcation.

The question of "dialogue" suggested by the Prime Minister of the Ethiopia, as an alternative to the Algiers Peace Treaty, is also illegal. The appointment of a "Special Envoy" by the UN Secretary General is a camouflage for derailing the work of the EEBC and appeasing the regime in Ethiopia. The State of Eritrea firmly believes that the issue of normalization of diplomatic relations or the creation of an atmosphere of confidence building will follow once the demarcation is fully implemented on the ground in accordance with the decision of the EEBC. Calling for dialogue while Ethiopia is still occupying sovereign Eritrean territory is just a perfect means to kill the decision and diminish the role of the EEBC. Purposely or naively, this issue was raised time and again by some countries and organizations.

I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to ascertain to you that neither the Secretary General, nor any super power has such authority to retract the ruling of the EEBC and declare the Algiers Peace Agreement null and void. The international community doesn't have such responsibility or authority, either. A Special Envoy without any clear mandate, without terms of reference and with no specified agenda has no right to mediate. The last visit of the Secretary General was a good opportunity for Eritrea to raise and clarify its stand on this issue. He was told

in black and white that the issue is not political, but a verdict of law. Hence, the assignment of a Special Envoy is illegal and not acceptable. The UN Secretary General has agreed to waive the Special Envoy's move.

Therefore, as far as Eritrea is concerned, the issue of a Special Envoy is closed. Furthermore, no one can be deceived by the outright lies of the regime in Ethiopia with regards to the border delimitation. There is no village or house that will be divided as the result of demarcation. If at all, such situations arise, it will be resolved during the demarcation and the EEBC has already included procedures on such issues in its verdict.

Furthermore, the implementation of the EEBC verdict is delayed not only due to the refusal of the regime in Ethiopia to abide by the verdict, but due to the weakness and reluctance of the international community as well. Unless the international community in general and the guarantors of the Algiers Peace Agreement in particular assume their responsibility, the situation could easily deteriorate, leading to extremely dangerous circumstances. The only concrete option remaining for all the parties is to avoid side issues and engage with prompt demarcation of the border by the EEBC. If there is anything outside these, then it is only a dangerous ploy, which is intended to buy time or to try to fool Eritrea. This may backfire on its planners, at the end.

In conclusion, I would like to reassure you that Eritrea is dedicated to respect the International Law. With the memory of Ethiopia's surprise declaration of war in May 1998 still fresh in our minds, anything else would be unforgivable. Since, Ethiopia's primary choice is war; the consequences will be horrific devastation to the two peoples. This does not encourage the culture of peace, but the culture of war. For the sake of justice and peace, it is imperative that the UN lives up to its Charter, principles, and commitments. It is also important that the guarantors stand by their commitment and show to Ethiopia and the rest of the world that rule of law prevails. To show reluctance and continue to be silent is a flagrant violation of the December 2000 Algiers Agreement. Article 14 of the Agreement gives the UNSC the authority to take measures against the offending party under Article 7 of the UN Charter.

## CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

There were more than 150 Participants each day at the conference with a wide range of backgrounds. Besides that, more than two hundred persons enjoyed the Horn of cultural evening show in the second day of the Horn of Africa conference. The participants' conference of the proceedings and workshops discussions among others were included:

- **Larry Andow**, Mayor of City of Lund, "*Welcoming and opening remarks*"
- **Zeinab Mohamed Mohmoud**, Sudanese Ambassador to Sweden, "*Statement*"
- **Nuria Mohammed**, Minister Counsellor, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia in Sweden, "*Statement*"
- **Gultie Berhanu**, 3rd Secretary of Ethiopian Embassy in Sweden
- **Araya Desta**, Eritrean Ambassador to Sweden, "*Statement*"
- **Yonas Manna Bairu**, Counsellor Embassy of Eritrea in Sweden
- **Daniel Tanui**, Kenyan Charge di' Affairs, Sweden, "*Statement*"
- **Mikeal Sönnerback**, Program Officer, Horn of Africa, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- **Inger Björk**, Secretary General, Forum Syd, "*The importance of civil society organisations in the transformation from war to peace with examples from different parts of the world*"
- **Helena Holver**, Programme Officer, Form Syd
- **Peter B. Marwa**, Director, Conflict Prevention for East African Countries, Inter-Governmental Authority for Development, "*The Status of IGAD Peace Process of Sudan & Somalia*"
- **Claudette Werleigh**, Director, Conflict Transformation Programme, Johan Svensson

L&P Horn of Africa Representative, Life & Peace Institute, *“Theoretical Reflections on Peacebuilding in Somalia – Experience of Life & Peace Institute”*

• **Dr. Tarekegn Adebo**, Research Coordinator, Life and Peace Institute, Uppsala, SIRC

Consultant, *“Post-Conflict Peacebuilding for Democracy – Democracy & Human Rights in the Horn of Africa”*

• **Dr. Kinf Abraham**, President, Ethiopian International Institute for Peace and

Development, *“The State of the Horn: with special focus on the Ethio-Eritrean Conflict”*

• **Bethlehem Araya**, Co-chair, conference organizer, WePot AB, Ideon Research in Lund

• **Dr. Arne Ardeberg**, Professor, Former Vice Chancellor of Lund University, *“Closing remarks of the conference”*

• **Dr. Salah Al Bander**, Director, Sudan Civic Foundation, Cambridge University,

SIRC Consultant; *“The Post Conflict Sudan – The triangle of National Security, Democratic Change and Sustainable Peace”*.

• **Angela Bystrom**, European Union Co-coordinator, Lund

• **Dr. Abdi Mohamed Gandi**, Professor, University of Besancon, France, *“The Nairobi Somali Peace Talks”*.

• **Dr. Martin Hill**, Senior Researcher, Horn of Africa, Amnesty International,

*“Ethiopian and Eritrea Conflict and Human Rights”*

• **Dr. Christian Webersik**, St. Antony’s College, African Studies Centre, Oxford

University, *“Bargaining for the spoils of war – The Somali National Reconciliation Process”*

• **Dr. Ali Moussa Iye**, Program Officer, UNESCO, Paris, France, SIRC Consultant,

*“Anticipative Studies & Scenario-Building Approach – Developing a New Vision of the Regional Co-operation in the Horn of Africa”*

• **Abdillahi Jama**, SIRC

• **Dr. Anders Narman**, Professor, Gothenburg University, *“The Greater Horn of Africa - Conflicts and the Civil Society”*

• **Dr. Janis Grobelaar**, Professor, Chair Department of Sociology, University of Pretoria, *“Lessons learned - South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission”*

• **Dr. Maxi Schoeman**, Head department of Political Science, University of Pretoria,

• **Dr. Mehari Gebre-Medhin**, Professor, Uppsala University, UNESCO Swedish Commission, *“Reflections on indicators of a decent society – lessons from the Horn of Africa”*

• **Dr. Mohamed Abusbib**, Lecturer, Uppsala University, *“The Question of Identity – A Root cause of violence, Sudan”*

• **Fowsia Abdulkadir**, Msc, human rights activist, Toronto, Canada, *“A critical reflection on Horn of Africa’s human rights predicament: Case – a gender-based perspective on Somali region of Ethiopia”*

• **Nadia Guled**, SIRC

• **Dr. Göte Hansson**, Professor, Department of Economics, Lund University

• **Dr. Zemenfes Tsighe**, Professor, Dean Department of Social Science, Asmara University, *“Eritrea and Ethiopia after the Algiers Agreement”*

• **Gillian Nilsson**, Head International Secretary, Social Democratic Party, Lund

• **Dr. Abdi Ismail Samatar**, Professor, Department of Geography and MacArthur

Program on International Peace and Co-operation, Minnesota University, *“Ethiopian federalism – Autonomy versus Control in the Somali Region”*

• **Dr. Elisabeth Woldegiorgis**, Head Institute of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa

University, *“Art as a definer of shared heritage & enduring legacies”*

• **Joel Frans**, Swedish Member of parliament, *“Democracy, rule of law & respect for human rights – experience from Sweden”*

• **Nicklas Svensson**, SIRC

• **Liban Wehlie**, SIRC

• **Dr. Håkan Wiberg**, Professor, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, Denmark,

*“Peace, Democracy and the Horn of Africa”*

• **Count Pietersen**, Former South African United Nations Ambassador, SIRC

• **Dr. Bereket Yebio**, Assistant Professor, Malmö University,

• **Abdullahi Elmi Mohamed**, PhD candidate, Institute of Technology, Stockholm SIRC  
Consultant

• **Dr. Abdalla Mohamed Jama**, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, SIRC Consultant

• **Dr. Welde-Ab Yisak**, President of the University of Asmara, *“Statement”*

• **Dr. Yokoub Abdi Aden**, Karolinska Hospital, SIRC Consultant

• **Dr. Bertil Egerö**, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Lund University,

*“Roots of the Eritrea-Ethiopia conflict – An interpretation”*

• **Engineer Ishael Siroiney**, SIRC Consultant

• **Dr. Sven Rubensson**, Retired Professor, Department of History, Lund University

• **Dr. Redeie Bereketeab**, Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala, “*Building a Culture of Peace in the Horn of Africa*”

• **Abdi Jama Ghedi**, former Somali National University lecturer, Chairman of Daryeel Association, SIRC Consultant

• **Anna Björn**, Lund Kommun

• **Sahra Abdullahi**, SIRC,

• **Zamzam Mohamed**, SIRC

• **Mohsen Abtin**, Head S-Association International and Member of Lund City Council

• **Associate Prof. Ferrow Embaie**, Lund University

• **Girma Awake**, Chairman of Ethiopian Association in Lund

• **Hannan Awad**, Board Member Sudanese Association in Lund

• **Dr. kamal Jamil**, Board member Sudan Association in Lund, Lund University

Hospital, Sudan Association Lund

• **Dr. Diya Awadi**, Chairman Sudanese Association in Lund, Malmö General Hospital

• **Ahmed Zarouk**, Board Member Sudanese Association In Lund

• **Nadia Osman**, Chairman Sudan Association in Lund

• **Engineer Mohamud Boss**, Chairman Center for Maritime, Reconstruction &

Rehabilitation – Somalia, SIRC Consultant

• **Mustafa Nasradin**, Chairman Eritrean Association in Lund

• **Kemesgen Belay**, Board Member, Eritrean Association in Lund

- **Howida Eid**, Board Member, Sudan Association in Lund
- **Rahel Haile**, Director Deab Travels in Lund
- **Amira Osman**, Peace Studies Department, University of Bradford, UK, “*Engendering Peace Process and Peace Reconstruction*”
- **Dr. Ulf Johansson Dahre**, Researcher, Department of Sociology, Lund University, “*The Role of Reconciliation in Peace-building*”
- **Dr. Zufan Araya**, Research Scientist, Biolnvent International AB,
- **Dr. Göran Djurfeldt**, Professor, Department of Sociology, Lund University
- **Mahdi Ali**, Göteborg, SIRC
- **Deeq Mohamed Qaaje**
- **Abdullahi Sh. Hussien**, Journalist Somaliweyn, Göteborg
- **Marianne Hedenbro**, Foreign Editor, Sydsvenskan
- **Dr. Abdulhadi Khalaf**, Assistant Professor, Lund University
- **Nina Widstrand**, Miljöbiblioteket, Lund
- **Lena Rössel**, Programme Officer Migration Issues, Social Mission, Stockholm
- **Joakim Björkman**, Student Linköping University,
- **Baffour Ankomah**, Editor NewAfrica Magazine, London, UK
- **Amun Abdullahi**, Reporter Radio Sweden
- **Abdullahi Hagi**, BBC Somali Section Senior Journalist who followed conference events by via cell phone

- **Mohamed Amin**, Mohamed Digital Video Company, Malmö
- **Omar Ahmed**, Student, Lund University
- **Ahmed Abdulkadir**, Lund University student
- **Muse Abraham**, Chairman Shabia Eritrea in Lund
- **Dr. Abdimunim Babu**, Swedish University of Agricultural Science
- **Tedros Mehretu**, The National Museum of World Cultures Advantage Göteborg
- **Abdalla Awad**, Board member Ethiopian Association in Lund
- **Elongima Meama-Kajue**, Academic
- **Sahel Aden**, Lund university student
- **Emma Sandahl**, UNICEF
- **Mattataa Sinkolongo**, academic
- **Prof. Omar Mohamed Adow**
- **Sebhat Habteab**, Eritrea Association Lund
- **Hussien Barkad**, SIRC
- **Ali Matan Barkhadle**, SIRC
- **Yonus Sium**, Eritrean Association,
- **Adan Suldan**, SODA
- **Per Lindqvist**, GIS-Centre, Lund University
- **Khaled Bayomi**, Department of History, Lund University
- **Sara Abdukadir**, Kavinno Forum in Lund

- **Sofie Allen**, Lund University
- **Lulseged H. Yohannes**, Advantage Göteborg (NMWC)
- **Fikru Mekonnen**, Advantage Göteborg (NMWC)
- **Yohannes W/Selassie**, Advantage Göteborg (NMWC)
- **Farah Samed**, PhD Student, University of East London
- **Jorge Capelan**, LIFS Lund
- **Shawqi Badri**, Academic
- **Asli Abraham**, Lund
- **Melaku Negash**, Eritrean Association Lund
- **Mickiel Woldemariam**, Lund
- **Getachew Darge**, Research Engineer, Lund University
- **Suad Mohamed**, Lund, SIRC
- **Magnus Lövgren**, Department of French & Linguistics, Lund University
- **Dr. Omar Abdulmajid**, Retired Sudanese Ambassador
- **Shane Quinn**, Desk Officer for Somalia, Life & Peace Institute
- **Keen Mohamed**, human rights activist, Holland
- **Malin Hedin**, academic, Kristianstad
- **Catarina Svärd**, Student, Lund University
- **Dr. Williams Brain**, Researcher, Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance

(IDEA)

- **Grip Elsa, Chairman** Vänortsföreningen Lund-asmara
- **Johan Svensson**, Horn of Africa Representative, Life & Peace Institute
- **Beate-Sophie Carlsson**, Student, Lund University
- **Raluca Soreanu**, Student, Lund University
- **Lulseged, Gebreyohannes**, Advantsge Hiritage Göteborg
- **Mohamoud Ahmed Nur Tarsan**, Somali Concern, UK
- **Filipa Wckenberg**, Sweden
- **Mari Malmberg**, Sweden
- *David Mcfarlane, National Coordinator Black PoliceAssistant, London, UK*
- **Stig Jarle Hansen**, Aberystwyth, University of Wales, UK
- **Ulldal-Malik**, Vice President European Network agaisnt Racism (ENAR)
- **Sebastian Bay**, The Association of Foreign Affairs in Lund
- **Dr. Madabuko Diakite**, The Lundian, Lund
- **Helge Dietrich**, UN –Assocation Lund
- **Hanok Araya, Lund**
- **Samson Araya, Lund**
- **Inger Kullgraft, Sweden**
- **Sara Girmay**, Ethiopian, Malmö
- **Åsa Elgameil**, Lund
- **Urban Wangel**, Lund
- **Furico Pinna, Florence, Italy**
- **Mohamed Ali Aden**, Malmö

## **HORN OF AFRICA CONFERENCE III:**

### **TRANSFORMING HORN OF AFRICA: CULTURE OF PEACE**

### **VS WAR CULTURE**

27-29 August, 2004

At Stadshallen, in Lund, Sweden

---



**Djibouti      Eritrea      Ethiopia      Somalia      Sudan**

---

Sponsored by:

Forum Syd/SIDA



Folkuniversitetet



**OLOF PALMES INTERNATIONELLA CENTRUM**

## Appendix 2

<b>Timeline</b>
<b>2000 (December)</b> Algiers Agreement signed
<b>2002 (April)</b> Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission (EEBC) ruling
<b>2002 to 2006</b> International mediation efforts, focused on EEBC, all without success
<b>2006 (December)</b> Ethiopian military intervention in southern Somalia, to combat Islamic Courts Union and bolster Transitional Federal Government
<b>2007 to 2009</b> Ethiopia occupation of Mogadishu and various parts of southern and central Somalia
<b>2007 (April)</b> Eritrea suspends its membership of the Intergovernmental Authority on development (IGAD), in protest against the regional bloc's support for the Ethiopian intervention in Somalia
<b>2008 (June)</b> Eritrea and Djibouti clash along border
<b>2008 (July)</b> Following more than a year of Eritrean restrictions on supplies and movements, the UN mission to patrol the border is dissolved.
<b>2009 (December)</b> UN Security Council adopts an arms embargo and targeted sanctions on Eritrean leadership, owing to Eritrean involvement in Somalia conflict and unresolved conflict with Djibouti

<b>2011 (January)</b> Eritrea sends envoy to AU summit in Addis Ababa for the first time in a decade
<b>2011 (July)</b> Eritrea indicates its intention to reactivate its IGAD membership
<b>2011 (November)</b> UN Security Council reaffirms and slightly toughens sanctions on Eritrea
<b>2011 to present</b> Eritrean begins exporting gold from Nevsun's Bisha mine
<b>2012 (August)</b> Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi dies, succeeded by his deputy, Hailemariam Desalegn
<b>2012 (September)</b> UN Human Rights Council appoints a special rapporteur on the situation in Eritrea
<b>2013 (January)</b> Mutinous Eritrean troops briefly occupy 'Forto', the site of the state broadcaster
<b>2013 (May)</b> UN special rapporteur releases report on Human rights in Eritrea

Source- Jason Mosley Africa Programme | April 2014 | AFP BP 2014/01. P. 4.

### Appendix 3

#### Questions for the Scholars

1. What do you think of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict after the closure of the EEBC operation?
2. How can the two countries resolve the conflict related issues amicably and re-install the brotherly relations that existed among the people of these two countries?
3. What could be the scholar's contribution in relation to the efforts towards the transition to peace, in conflict resolution, in re-establishing sense of understanding among the population and in reconciliation?
4. How can the scholars as one section of the society can engage themselves in finding peaceful solutions to the conflicting issues?
5. How do the scholars critically analyse their previous involvement in the search for peace and reconciliation? Mentioning and elaborating achievements and failures which could be in writing the history between the two countries and in analysing the root causes of the conflict.
6. What are the core issues concerning the root causes of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict that can be addressed/resolved by the scholars? Issues like Socio-psychological causes, "superiority complex" and soon.
7. What are some of the applicable peace strategies forwarded/constructed by scholars?
8. What are the necessary, sufficient and favourable conditions for engaging in peace process?
9. Which conflict resolution mechanism will be best for Ethio-Eritrea conflict, indigenous or modern? Why?
10. Do you acknowledge and accept Eritrea as a sovereign nation state? If not, why not?
11. Any additional comments will be appreciated.

## Questionnaire

1. The contribution of scholars and intellectuals to resolve the Ethio-Eritrea conflict peacefully and reconstructing the broken relationship has been limited/ineffective. Why such contribution is limited?

---

---

---

2. Do you agree that the scholars and intellectuals contribution to make peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea is limited?

A. Yes

B. No

3. What would be the comprehensive peace strategy that can be forwarded by scholars to address the root-causes of the Ethio-Eritrea conflict?

---

---

---

4. How do the scholars critically analyse their previous involvement in the search for peace and reconciliation among the population of the two countries? Mention and Elaborate achievements (if any) or successes after holding conferences, forums, workshops and failures which could be in-terms of analysing the root-causes of the conflict and soon.

---

---

---

5. Why the scholars failed to play an instrumental role in resolving the conflict and in reconciling the relations between the two country's populations?

---

---

---

6. Have you ever participated in any peace activity or in any peace dialogues, forums, conferences or problem-solving workshops? If yes, explain briefly about the event and your contribution.

---

---

---

7. What possible contributions can scholars and intellectuals make in the near future in finding peaceful solutions to the conflicting issues and in reconciling the brotherly relationship that existed among the people of these two countries?

---

---

---

8. Some Ethiopian scholars have been accused of rejecting Eritrean independence. Do you acknowledge and accept Eritrea as a sovereign nation state? If not, why not?

---

---

---

9. How can the scholars and intellectuals using their knowledge and skills be successfully used in order to create peace and reconciliation in the Ethio-Eritrea conflict?

---

---

---

10. What are the necessary, sufficient and favourable conditions for engaging in peace and reconciliation process?

---

---

11. Do you consider yourself as a role model for creating deep sense of understanding among the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea and for promoting peaceful action among the youth? If yes, how?

---

---

---

12. What are the direct and/ or indirect contribution of scholars and intellectuals in reconciliation and in making peace between Ethiopia and Eritrea?

---

---

---

13. Do you think and support that writing a common history between Ethiopia and Eritrea on core issues and divergent narration of historical happenings like on accounts of prominent historical figures, the abrogation of the 1962 federation, “superiority-inferiority complex”, question of port, etc. by scholars of both countries can contribute positively to the peace process? How?

---

---

---

14. How can the people of these two countries cooperate, integrate and reconstruct the broken fraternal relationship among them?

---

---

---

15. Which conflict resolution mechanism will be suitable to resolve the Ethio-Eritrea conflict, indigenous (traditional) or modern? And why

---

---

---

16. How can the scholars and intellectuals overcome their challenges in finding peaceful solutions to the Ethio-Eritrea conflict?

## Appendix 4

### List of informants

No	Name	Organization	Position	Date
1	Prof. Issac Tseggai	Missouri University of Science Technology	Associate professor of political science	Via Skype 15/2/16
2	Prof. Gebru Tareq	-	Professor of History	7/3/16
3	Associate. Prof. Kassahun Berhanu	Addis Ababa University	Associate Prof. Of political science and International Relations	7/3/16
4	Prof.Assefaw Bairagabr	Seton Hall University	Professor of Diplomacy and International Relations, Director, post Conflict State Reconstruction and Sustainability	Via Skype 3/1/16
5	Phd candidate. Goitom Gebreluel	Cambridge University	Political Consultant and writes on Eritrea's foreign policy	21/3/16
6	Assistant Prof. Michael Weldemariam	Boston University	Assistant professor of International Relations and Political Science	Via Skype 3/27/16
7	Dr.Hailom Banteyerga	Addis Ababa University	-	2/26/16
8	Prof.Shumet Sishagne	Illinois University	Professor of African history and wrote many publications on Ethiopia and Eritrea	Via Skype 2/25/16
9	Mr. Gebru Asrat	-	Former member of the politburo of the TPLF and wrote book and articles on Ethiopia and Eritrea	14/4/16
10	Dr. Solomon Mebrie	Addis Ababa University	Assistant Professor of political science and international relations	25/2/16
11	Assistant Prof.MeressaTsehaye	Mekele University	Assistant professor of political science and writes on Ethio-Eritrea politics	14/3/16

Questionnaire responses through email

1	Prof.Kidane Mengsteab	The Pennsylvania State University	Professor of African Studies and Political Science	-
2	Prof.Tekeste Negash	Uppsala University	Professor of history and has many publications on Ethio-Eritrea relation	-
3	Mr.Tesfu Altaseb (MA in journalism and communication)	-	Wrote book on Ethio- Eritrea conflict	-
4	Phd. Candidate Andargachew	IPSS	Writing Phd. dissertation on Ethio-Eritrea conflict	-

## Appendix 5 Letter sent to scholars through their email addresses

**Fireweini Habtom Gebrekidan**

Email- [Ferae.hab64@yahoo.com](mailto:Ferae.hab64@yahoo.com) or  
[Frehab72@gmail.com](mailto:Frehab72@gmail.com)

► Prof...

---

**Dear: Prof...,**

Hello Prof..., My name is Freweini Habtom Gebrekidan. I am a Masters student at the Institute for peace and security studies, Addis Ababa University. I am doing my thesis on **Ethio-Eritrea Conflict and the Role of Scholars and Intellectuals in the ‘Stalled’ Process of Peace and Reconciliation**. I am interested in the title of the study because I am an Ethiopian who was born from an Eritrean father and Ethiopian mother but separated from my father in the early years of my life due to his deportation to Eritrea. It is always my dream and my desire to work for peace between the two countries and for the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of these two neighbouring peoples. The main focus of the study is on prominent Ethiopian and Eritrean scholars and intellectuals who have deep understanding and knowledge of the issues entangled in the conflict and committed themselves in writing and conducting research on these two nations. Moreover, I appreciate your positive roles and eager to study your contribution to the peace process which mostly concentrates on advocacy of peace and reconciliation among the peoples of these two countries. Besides, you are an extraordinary Ethiopian/Eritrean scholar who is devoted to make peace between the people of Ethiopia and Eritrea.

My research is for academic purpose. With all due respect, I kindly request your good will to give me permission to conduct in-depth interviews with you in person or through Skype. My Skype account is **frehabtom**. If you are busy, I attached a questionnaire please check it. I am very optimistic that your response will be positive, arrange the date and time for the interview and notify me through the above email or you will fill the questionnaire. I am very happy and thankful to you. Hopefully, you will recognize my ambition and efforts I have made so far for the fruitful outcome of the research. I know that this is not the right way I should have approached for your cooperation but I do not have a choice, you will definitely understand the circumstances.

**Thank you in advance for your support and cooperation!**

Best Regards,

---

## **Declaration**

I, undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Candidate

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisor

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Submission \_\_\_\_\_