

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN ETHIO-US SECURITY
RELATIONSHIPS**

**By
FELEKE DEBELA ZEWDIE**

**ADDIS ABBA
APRIL, 2011**

**CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN ETHIO-US SECURITY
RELATIONSHIPS**

**BY
FELEKE DEBELA ZEWDIE**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
OF THE ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**ADVISOR
DR. ASNAKE KEFALE**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**ADDIS ABBA
APRIL, 2011**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

**CHANGES AND CONTINUITIES IN ETHIO-US SECURITY
RELATIONSHIPS**

**BY
FELEKE DEBELA ZEWDIE**

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

SIGNATURE

DATE

ADVISOR

EXAMINER

Acknowledgments

I am greatly indebted to the welcome support and assistance I received from my relatives and friends in the accomplishment of my essay and pursuit of my studies. Above all, my advisor Dr. Asnake Kefale deserves my most sincere and heartfelt appreciation and thanks for his scholarly and academic assistance, patience and willingness, which he was kind enough to offer me. Moreover, his prompt responses in the process of reading and commenting the draft script of my essay, his substantial advice, valuable comments, strategic guidance, and his friendly approach that he enthusiastically provided have certainly shaped my thesis to embrace its current essence and structure. My instructors in Political Science and International Relations' staff and my classmates with whom I shared many memorable experiences, will always live in a special part of my memory. Ato Tafese Olika and Dr. Merera Gudina also deserve my special gratitude for their supply of pertinent materials for my study and for the moral support that they offered. I am as well indebted to uncle Agonafir Demissie's family chiefly W/o Mmite Dagne, Ato Amare Agonafir, W/o Tiruwork Agonfir, w/o Genet Agonafir, w/o Yeshihareg Agonafir, Ato Seyoum Agonafir and Ato Tekeste Yayenu for their moral support and the accommodation they offered me during all my stay with them for my academic work . They were not only hospitable to me they also considered me as one of their family members and did everything possible. Last but not least, the moral and material contributions of my family members: W/o Menen Mersha, Dagmawi Feleke, and Salsawi Feleke towards all my accomplishments are worth mentioning. Especially, my two daughters Mahteme Feleke and Hibist Feleke with whom I shared my academic life in the Addis Ababa University and their support in typing my thesis and above all their consistent moral support and encouragement remains with me forever ceaselessly.

Abstract

International relations as a discipline that studies the interactions between and among states have gripped the attention of many scholars. These scholars have derived different theories and principles that are presumed to result in smoother and cooperative relations between and among states. Despite the development of diverse theories and principles of international relations, contacts between and among states have not been as contemplated by those good wishing scholars. In this regard, the coherent nature of international relations- cooperation and conflict-have persistently continued. Plus, these features of international relations are still governing the trends of relations between states.

Ethio-US relation is not an exception in this regard. The century old relations between Ethiopia and the United States have so far been traversing through these controversial features- conflict and cooperation. The cooperative features of the Ethio-US relations have contributed to the buildup and the continuity of the cordial relations. On the other hand, the conflicting characteristic of the relations between the two countries have brought in changes in the manner of the relations from a friendly type to an unfriendly mode, or have contributed to the shaping of unpleasant and hostile relations.

This essay endeavors to identify the factors that have contributed to the continuity of the friendly relations between the United States and Ethiopia. On the other hand, the factors that have resulted in changes in the gracious relations between the two countries have also been scrutinized.

The methodology applied to gather the data is a qualitative one. This method is put in use because; the data used in conducting the research is totally related to words observations, and the approach has been analyzing and interpreting the data. By examining, analyzing and interpreting the data the thesis has identified the factors of Ethio-US security relations. Accordingly, the Kagnew Communication Base, the secessionist group in Eritrea, the Republic of Somalia before and after its disintegration, the Cold War phenomena, the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the geo-political position of Ethiopia, and the international political system have been identified as the major ones. These factors of relations have played different roles in shaping the relations to continue either in a friendly fashion or to change the mode of the relations

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter One: Background	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Research Questions.....	3
1.4. General Objective of the Study.....	4
1.5. Specific Objectives of the Study.....	4
1.6. Methodology and Methods	4
1.7. Significance of the Study	5
1.8. Limitations and Scope of the Study.....	6
1.9. Organization of the Thesis.....	7
Chapter Two: Ethio-US Security Relationships-Conceptual and Theoretical Framework	9
2.1. Introduction.....	9
2.2. The Theory of Realism: A Brief Explanation.....	9
2.3. Concepts of National Interest and National Security	11
2.4. Meaning and Role of Foreign Policy.....	13
2.5. The Foreign Policy of a Dependent State	15
2.6. Chapter Summary	16
Chapter Three: A Brief History of Ethio-US Security Relationships	18
3.1. Introduction.....	18

3.2. The Informal Relations Prior to 1903.....	18
3.3. Commencement and Move of the Formal Diplomatic Relationships	21
3.4. Ethio-US Relations in the Post Occupation Era	29
3.4.1. Relations with the Haile Selassie Regime.....	29
3.4.2. Relations in the Post -1974 Period	42
3.4.3. Ethio-US Relations Since 1991.....	45
3.5. Chapter Summary	48
Chapter Four: The Role of Factors of Relations in Ethio-US Security Relationships	51
4.1. Introduction.....	51
4.2. The Features of Ethio-US Security Relationships during the Imperial Regime.....	52
4.3. General Trends in Ethio-US Security Relationships	57
4.4. Chapter Summary	67
Chapter Five: Conclusion	71
Bibliography.....	79

Chapter One: Background

1.1. Introduction

This thesis tries to examine the security relationships between Ethiopia and the United States from 1941 to present. The study is interested in identifying the elements that are termed as factors of relations in the thesis and makes its level best effort to examine the role these factors have played either in changing the mode of the security relations or in enhancing its continuity in a similar style. This is done by studying the history of the relations, by recognizing the ups and downs that their relations have faced in due course of its process, by establishing questions and cases that could help to further understand the ties between the two countries. Finally, the thesis is supposed to come up with some ideas that better help to understand the security relations between the United States and Ethiopia.

Security relationships between and among states have been very essential particularly since the end of the II World War. This happened to be because; the end of the war heralded the division of the global system in two major blocs. The division was based on ideological differences namely Capitalism and Socialism. The partition was characterized by rivalry and competition for sphere of influence by the great powers. This condition compelled states of the world to ally to either of the blocs. Otherwise, the national security of states was not guaranteed. Accordingly, Ethiopia that previously set up its relations with the United States at the verge of the 20th century was obliged to further strengthen the relationships after the defeat of the fascist forces in Ethiopia in 1941. The pressure exerted on Ethiopia by the British forces and their act that threatened the national security of the country after the occupation of Italy was the reason for Ethiopia's demand to strengthen ties with the US. Ethiopia's security relationships with the United States were also influenced by the emergence of the Cold War phenomena after the Second World War. This was as well upheld by the US interest to deter the Communist expansion in the eastern, north eastern and central Africa. As Ethiopia was also opposed to the idea of Communism at that time, the deterrence of this stance had helped the two countries to work hand in hand in this regard. However, this condition did not last long. Developments in scientific innovations such as the satellite technology negatively affected their security relations in the latter years of the 1960s. This was due to the replacement of the services of the Kagew Base by these new innovations. At the time of the Derg, the security relationships between the

two countries were severely affected due to ideological reasons. Ethio-US security relations have improved with the present government of Ethiopia. The emergence of international terrorism in Somalia and the antagonism of this group both to the United States and Ethiopia have laid the basis to the strengthening of their security relationships at the present time.

In the present world although globalization is said to better serve the needs of states with varying interests, the idea has not been fully materialized for the lack of unanimous outlook towards the idea of Globalization and the absence of a central authority that can put this principle in effect. To this end, states are still concerned about the achievements of their interests by their own. This leads to the rise of conflicts of interests. When conflicts of interests arise between states and among states and when the differences are not resolved through round table negotiations, states are obliged to secure their interests by force. This unquestionably requires the strength of their military capacity. This is usually unaffordable particularly for small states. Such states need to forge security relationships with other states. Thus, Security relationships are still valid and important even in this present world, where the idea of Globalization is pronounced now and then. In the last two decades after the EPRDF has come to power, the security relationships have improved and the two countries - Ethiopia and the US- are working in a closer manner to deter the spread of international terrorism in the Horn of Africa and avoid the harm of international terrorism on their interests. In view of this the principle of globalization has not been able to put away the existence and the role of security relationships between and among countries even in the present world. To this end the idea and practice of security relationships are still valid and important.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Ethiopia and the United States concluded an agreement that allowed the US to have unhampered access over the kagnew base and other military facilities in Eritrea for 25 years in 1953. The agreement also provided military assistance and military trainings to Ethiopia from the US. Following the agreement the two countries had worked as allies particularly in the combat that took place between the two Koreans and in the containment of communism. Ethiopia had benefited financial and military assistances from the US at times. The US has also made use of the strategic position of Ethiopia to secure its interests in the Horn of Africa, the Middle East, and the Persian Gulf. At present, Ethiopia and the US are working against the

spread and attack of international terrorism especially in the Horn of Africa. The two countries had worked and are still working as allies in protecting their security interests. The US is providing substantial financial and military assistance to Ethiopia in relation to its partnership in the fight against international terrorism.

However, the cooperation between the two countries in the security perspective is not carried out without doubts. Their security relationships have been challenged by some disagreements and controversies. In 1962-63 when Somalia threatened Ethiopia by mounting the notion of greater Somalia the US refused to provide arms assistance to Ethiopia. In contrast the US by collaborating with its Western allies granted arms to Somalia. This act highly dismayed the emperor and severed the relations between the two countries. The US completely abandoned Ethiopia and sided with Somalia in the fight that took place over the Ogaden region in 1977-78. Ethiopia's national security and territorial integrity was threatened during this time. Furthermore, the US also sanctioned the sale of arms to Ethiopia, which the payment was already done for. The United States had also urged Saudi Arabia to support Somalia in its fight against Ethiopia. In this regard, the United States that was entrusted to assist Ethiopia in its endeavor in protecting and maintaining its national security and territorial integrity, had at times worked against the security and territorial integrity of Ethiopia.

This thesis is interested in examining, assessing, analyzing, and understanding the controversy that had taken place in the security relationships between the two countries. By doing so, the thesis has tried to identify the causes that resulted in disagreements in the course of the relationships. The thesis has also identified the factors of relations that played roles in shaping the security relations between the two nations. It as well has made its level best effort to surface the role of those factors in bringing changes and/or continuities in the mode of the relationships in the long history of the diplomatic ties of Ethiopia and the United States.

1.3. Research Questions

This thesis examines and analyzes the following questions:

- 1.3.1. What motivated the US interest towards Ethiopia after World War II; and why did the Ethio-US relations decline in the late days of the emperor?

- 1.3.2. What factors of relations contributed to the changes and continuities in the relations between the two countries?
- 1.3.3. What features characterize the present day relationships between Ethiopia and the US, and what factors contributed to this present situation?
- 1.3.4. Given the present day international political system what should be the future scenario of Ethio-US security relationships?

1.4. General Objective of the Study

The major objective of this study is to examine the Ethio-US security relations by learning its history and by finding out the factors that shaped their security relations in due course of time. This is done by assessing the contributions of those factors either for the promotion and/or decline of the relationships. The thesis as well brings to light the factors that contributed and are contributing to the changes and continuities in the security relations between the two countries.

1.5. Specific Objectives of the Study

The thesis appreciates the following issues as its specific objectives:

- 1.5.1. Gather information on Ethio-US security relationships, examine, assess, and analyze the information in order to understand the feature of the relations.
- 1.5.2. Identify the factors of Ethio- US security relationships and the roles that these factors of relations have played either negatively and /or positively.
- 1.5.3. Make out the impacts of the factors of Ethio-US security relations from the point of view of Changes and continuities that have taken place within the period of the study.
- 1.5.4. Based on the assessment and the outcome of the study the thesis hints what a trend Ethio-US security relationships should go along.

1.6. Methodology and Methods

This study is based on a qualitative data collecting methodology - a data that approximates characteristics, properties, etc., of a thing or phenomenon, but does not measure the attributes of a phenomenon. Quality data consists of words and observations, but not actually numbers. It is a basic approach for analyzing and interpreting narrative data often referred to as content analysis. In line with the above features of the method chosen to conduct the process of the data

collection, the information has been mainly collected from different books, internet sources, journal articles, and published and unpublished materials. This has been accomplished by selecting the materials that are believed to fit to the purpose of the study and which are considered to comply with the research objectives. The reading and of jotting notes on the important points were carried out simultaneously. After the important information was gathered it was carefully read and re-read. Consequently, the information that has been collected from different sources were sorted and categorized to the chapters of the thesis according to their relevance. Following this process, the draft of each of the chapters have been put pen to paper by using the information. In the process of writing the thesis, the information has been examined, assessed, and analyzed so that they could respond to the statement of the problem, the research questions, the general and specific objectives, the additional questions raised, and cases established in the process of writing the thesis.

As regard to the analysis of the data, the information has been examined and assessed to identify the factors of the security relations between the two countries. The roles of those factors of relationships have also been assessed. The information has as well been examined and assessed to realize the impacts that these factors of relations have resulted in either negatively and/or positively. Assessments have also been accomplished to learn whether those factors of relations have resulted changes or continuities in the security relationships between the two countries. Additional questions are set up and cases are established on the important points to better examine and understand the factors of relations, their roles, and the course of the security relationships.

1.7. Significance of the Study

The United States of America is one of the great powers of the present global system. The US is also one of the oldest diplomatic partners of Ethiopia. Ethiopia has benefitted much from its relations with the US. In addition to Ethiopia's benefits in economic, political, security and social affairs that it obtains from the US, its cordial relations with the US also fosters a high influence on the friendly relations that Ethiopia would like to have with the western countries and with other friendly nations of the US in the other parts of the world. In this regard, the US has a great bearing on the general diplomatic exercise of Ethiopia. Likewise, the cordial relations between the two countries are also of a paramount importance to the US to securing its

interests and to maximize its influence in the Horn Region. In this vein, the friendly relations between the two countries are very important for both Ethiopia and the United states.

However, some inconveniences and disputes have been observed between the two countries occasionally. In this regard, for a better understanding of their relations, their policies and behaviors towards one another and the investigation and analysis of their relations is very essential. . From this point of view, this thesis examines, analyzes, and tries to depict the positive and negative factors in the relations between the two countries. And in the final analysis, the research tries to bring to the fore the factors that have played a positive role and that have contributed negatively in the process of the relations between the two countries. Consequently, the thesis comes up with the factors that have contributed to the progress and/or decline of the relations between the two countries. Based on the discussions changes and continues in the relations are sorted. From the above points of view, this study is very timely and imperative for the academic and pragmatic exercise in the relations between the two countries. Besides, this study can serve as a spring board for further studies and investigations that may be interested to deal in the security relations between the two countries.

1.8. Limitations and Scope of the Study

The methodology followed to collect the data that has been used in conducting this study is limited to secondary data sources like books, journal articles, internet sources, and published and unpublished materials. In this regard primary data collecting methods such as interviews, questionnaires, and focused group discussions have not been used. The study is also limited to the period after the end of the occupation of Ethiopia by fascist Italy 1941. Furthermore, because of the change of procedures in writing the MA thesis in the Addis Ababa University, the time for writing the thesis has been shortened. This has created stress on the work of this research. In this regard there is a fear from the student side that the reduction of the period for the research writing may have an impact on the general process of the thesis. The other limitation refers to the shortage of pertinent materials for the study. The Addis Ababa University and other libraries in Addis Ababa were visited to find recent and relevant materials. However, except for some books, which are made available by individual personalities, it was hardly possible to get update books from the libraries mentioned above. On the other hand, Etho-US relations are very broad and include many aspects like economic, political, social, and,

security areas. Nonetheless, this thesis because of its limited scope has been confined to the study of the security relations between the two countries. In this regard, the research is bound to a small section of the diplomatic ties between the two countries-the security perspective. For that matter, the research is not a comprehensive one and has been restricted merely to the study of Etio-US security relationships.

1.9. Organization of the Thesis

The first chapter of the thesis begins by introducing the topic of the study. Then forwards the importance of security relationships between states since the Second World War and how it is important now despite the idea and practice of globalization is brought to the fore. The rest part of the chapter highlights the design of the research and techniques followed in examining, assessing and writing the research. This includes: statement of the problem, research questions, general and specific objectives, methodology and methods, significance of the study, limitations and scope of the study, and organization of the thesis.

The second chapter deals with the conceptual and theoretical framework of the Ethio-US relations. Accordingly, the chapter briefly discusses the theory of realism, the concept of national interest, the idea of national security, the meaning and role of foreign policy and the foreign policy of a dependent state. The purpose of this chapter is aimed at giving a bird's eye view on the nature and applications of these ideas, theories, principles and concepts. In most cases these principles and ideas in the chapter have been associated with the processes in Ethio-US security relationships.

The third chapter deals with the historical background of Ethio-US relations. In this section the informal relationship that existed prior to the establishment of the ceremonious ties between the two countries is brought to the surface. That means there were people to people and trade relations between Ethiopia and the US prior to 1903. The other section of the chapter discusses the commencement and the move of the formal diplomatic ties between the two countries. This part attempts to identify and analyze the factors that have shaped Ethio-US relations at different occasions. The roles of these factors have been examined to realize whether their impacts were positive or negative in due course of the relations.

Chapter four is the unit that examines and analyzes the changes and continuities in Ethio-US security relations. The assessment is carried out by focusing on the factors of the relations. The assessment and analysis is done by using those factors of relations, which have been identified in chapter three. The process of the analysis is dealt by picking up the factors of relations and by examining their contributions from the point of view of continuity and change in the relations. The chapter is divided in two sub-sections; features of the relations during the time of Haile Silasie and the general trends in the Ethio-US relations. All chapters are ended by highlighting the main ideas that are examined, discussed and analyzed in the chapters respectively.

Chapter five is the part that comprises the conclusion of the thesis. Since each chapter has its own summary, this part deals with the general ideas that the thesis would like to forward. Accordingly, in this part the thesis has tried to suggest ideas that it believes are important in promoting relationships between and among states.

Chapter Two: Ethio-US Security Relationships-Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

2.1. Introduction

This part of the thesis brings to the fore a theory, principles, and ideas that are used in assessing and analyzing the information that is put in use to writing the thesis. This includes: the theory of realism, the concepts of national security and national interest, the meaning and role of foreign policy, and the foreign policy of a dependent state. These conceptual and theoretical perspectives are dealt here to briefly discuss their features and roles that they play in the relations between and among nations. In the mean time attempts have been made to show how they are related to Ethio-US security relationships. Accordingly, in discussing the concepts attempts have been made to imply the significance these conceptual and theoretical perspectives have in analyzing and understanding relationships. This condition depicts that international relationships cannot be examined, analyzed and clearly understood without the application of such theories, concepts, and ideas that are pertinent to the subjects in the discussions. To this end, the concepts hereunder help us as goggles to magnify and set up clear pictures about the conditions and factors of relations that are brought to the surface in due course of examining, assessing and analyzing the information and as well as in writing the thesis. These ideas and concepts are explained in brief hereunder:

2.2. The Theory of Realism: A Brief Explanation

Political realism is one of the schools of political thought, which is opposed to the idea of the theory of idealism. The proponents of the idea of realism argue that power is the immediate aim of international relations. Morgenthau writes as under to this end: “In International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power (Morgenthau 2003). Whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is always the immediate aim” (Morgenthau 2003). The meaning of realism is also very much entwined with the idea of security and power. In this regard security is a priority for all states. And to maintain security the possession of a relatively more power is very essential and indispensable according to the idea of realism. Malhotra also explains this notion by relating it to the belief of individuals: Its meaning revolves around security and power factors. These notions are the outcome of individuals` beliefs that, others are always trying to

destroy him and hence he must be constantly ready to kill others in order to protect himself' (Malhotra, 2001:117).

With this state of mind, states that adopt the realist theory prefer to make their power stronger than others. AS underscored in the above statements, this is meant with the attitude that others are always in need to attack them and that their readiness could help them to challenge and to defeat those enemies at any circumstance and point of their attack. For that matter, they are always in a state of building their military capacity and checking and rearranging their military alliances now and then. Accordingly, the United States and Ethiopia could be categorized to this group of countries and we shall be looking into this state of affairs by assessing some of their activities.

The establishments of US military bases in different parts of the world after the Second World War for the containment of communism could be taken as the practical application of the theory of realism. The arms race that took place between the US and the Soviet Union were conditions that implied the function that can be attributed to the theory of political realism. The military supremacy that the US pursues even in the present global system emanates from the nature and adoption of this theory.

Ethiopia's arms competition with the then Republic of Somalia in the 1960s and 1970s can be said was the idea that found its roots in the principle of the realist theory. The incessant arms request of Haile Selassie from the US as well implies the application of the theory by Ethiopia to excel the military capacity of Somalia in order to beat the forces of Somalia at any state of aggression. The need and the practice of building a huge and the greatest military might in Africa by the military administration of Ethiopia since the mid 1970s and in the 1980s also resulted from the notion of the theory of realism. The present day of Ethiopia in order to withstand the threats from the international terrorism and Eritrea is also engaged in strengthening its military capacity. In sum, both the US and Ethiopia have favored the theory of political realism in the pursuit of their security and military capacity. This is also true to other nations that are threatened by rival neighbor in countries. Generally, the theory of realism that had highly dominated the international relations between and among nations during the Cold War era is still influencing relationships between nations.

2.3. Concepts of National Interest and National Security

The term national interest can be perceived as a high ranking or grand interest of a nation, which is presumed to belong to all members of the state. Gove (1976:1505) defines the term as follows: “National interest is the interest of a nation as a whole held to be an independent entity separate from the interest of subordinate areas of groups and also of other nations or supra national groups.” According to this explanation national interest is viewed to be the interest of the nation in general and which cannot be over whelmed by the interests of groups within the country or by the interests of other external bodies. It gives the bases and a clue for the formulation of the foreign policy of a state. It is as well a central part on which the relationships between states are brought into being. Malhotra gives a brief but a clear explanation about this concept when he writes:

National interest is the most crucial concept in international relations. It is the key concept in foreign policy as it provides the material on the bases of which foreign policy is made. It is the purpose of foreign policy to conduct foreign relations in a way so as to achieve national interest to the maximum extent. The notion of national interest is central to any attempt at describing, explaining, predicting and understanding international relations (Malhotar, 2001:79).

The above explanation gives all the attributes of national interest. Accordingly, the explanation emphasizes that national interest is the most important element in international relations. It also tells that this concept is the key factor in formulating the foreign policy of a state. That means elements in the national interest dictate the type of foreign policy to be devised. The explanation also implies the interconnection between national interest and foreign policy. On the one hand, national interest provides the ground at which a foreign policy is formulated and on the other hand, it indicates the endeavor that a foreign policy makes to achieve the goals of the national interest. In the final analysis, the explanation describes that every activity carried out to advance international relations is well done when viewed through the perspectives of national interest. Thus, we can safely say that a clear and unambiguous understanding of the concept and feature of national interest is of a paramount importance in dealing with the idea and practice of international relations. To Ethiopia, this implies the identification and prioritizing its national interests, formulating pertinent foreign policy frame work, and establishing relations with countries that are presumed to work in addressing their bilateral interests with Ethiopia.

The concept of security can be perceived as freedom from: danger, fear, anxiety and uncertainty. It is also understood as a basis for confidence. It is also regarded as something that secures, defends, and protects someone or something from any possible circumstance that threatens and/or actually affects one's well being. In addition, measures taken by a national government or governmental units to guard against espionage are also utilized to explain the concept of security (Gove, 1976:2053). The right to protection from physical abuse and attack is also used to explain the notion of security (Hutchful, 2000:221). The notion of national security is defined by the Ethiopian Ministry of Information Press and Audiovisual Department (MIP & AD) (2002:4) in the following words:

In a fundamental sense, security policy is a matter of insuring national survival. The alpha and omega of security is the insuring of national survival. Other national security issues may be raised only if national existence is insured. Foreign affairs and security policy must be formulated first and for most to insure national security. Issues of prosperity, sustainable peace, and stability and other related concerns then follow.

As stated clearly and precisely above, the issue of security is the most vital and essential element in the course of preserving the existence of a state. It is the core issue in the process of maintaining the survival of a nation. According to the statement above, other national interests of a state are rated secondary to national security. In this vein, Ethiopia is a country that has given due concern to this policy. Accordingly in its long history the issue of security has remained the element that has gripped the attention of its leaders. Although, the profound attention owed to national security may have its pressure on the development of the country, the attention given to national security has greatly contributed to the national security and territorial integrity of the nation. More to the point, Ethio-US relations have its roots in preserving the security of the country when viewed from the point of view of the Ethiopian leaders. This is so because; Ethio-US relations since their inception have mainly been directed to the security of Ethiopia from the part of the Ethiopian leaders, and most of the focuses of the interactions of the Ethiopian leaders with that of the US have been on security matters.

The concepts of national interest and national security are very much entwined because; national security is the core element and vital value of a national interest. As mentioned above, the principle of national security, have remained to be the most important and even the first of

all the national interests in the foreign policy of Ethiopia in its relations with the United States America.

2.4. Meaning and Role of Foreign Policy

The term foreign policy in general is used to explain directions and guide lines that states formulate to use as guiding principles in their diverse interactions with other states and international organizations. The term foreign policy is defined as follows by Gove (1976:889):

Foreign policy is the underlying basic directions of a sovereign state in its interaction with other sovereign states typically manifested in peace, war, neutrality, and alliance or various combinations of or approaches to these.

According to the above statement, states behave and act in their international interactions in accordance to the principles that they design to peruse their objectives in the international arena.

The foreign policy of any country is determined by a number of elements. These elements may be broadly classified as objective and subjective. The objective or environmental factors determine the general framework within which the foreign policy is to operate. The subjective factors determine the specific response to a particular situation and indicate the direction of a foreign policy (Sirvastava, 2003:393). Malhotra (2001:185) lists five elements that he believes are common objectives of a foreign policy of all nations: “maintaining the integrity of a state; promoting economic interest; providing for national security; providing for national prestige and developing national power; and maintaining world order.” With this frame of mind, we now try to throw a bird’s eye view on the nature and features of the foreign policies of Ethiopia and the US and the roles these policies take part in shaping the Ethio-US relations.

As is the case with all other countries particularly developing countries, Ethiopia has been susceptible and vulnerable to external pressures and influences. To this end, Ethiopia’s foreign relations have been conditioned by pressures from hostile and friendly elements. Over the years, Ethiopia’s foreign policy has increasingly become defensive in design and operation than aggressive in that it has been reacting mostly to felt or presumed outside pressure rather than taking initiatives of its own in foreign affairs (Negussay, 1978:53). To this end, it is worth noting that the different regimes of Ethiopia have been forced to give more emphasis to the security and territorial integrity of the country. Likewise, the foreign relations of the country

have been greatly influenced by its security relations. This is very much reflected in the Ethio-US relations. In contrast, the country's development seems to be overshadowed by the high regard owed to the security of the nation. And this has got a negative impact on the overall progress of the country.

As clearly indicated in the above premises, the foreign policy of Ethiopia is not a policy formulated based on the assessment made on the objective and subjective elements of the country. Mainly it is a policy which had aimed at responding to pressures and influences exerted from the outside world. The US is among those countries that have been influencing Ethiopia's foreign policy in a considerable manner. Although, the two countries have had relations prior to World War II, the US influence has been very strong since the end of the Second World War. This was so because; after the war the US became one of the bipolar centers and hegemonic state of the international system. Accordingly it changed its policy of isolation and started to play a very active role in the international affairs. Sirvastava underscores this major change in the policy of the US in the following vocabulary:

Since the end of World War II the US surrendered her traditional policy of isolation and assumed the role of protectorate of democracy. She mainly concentrated on checking communism. For this purpose she mainly concluded regional pacts as well as bilateral treaties with a number of countries (Sirvastava, 2003:44).

In this regard, Ethiopia was one of the countries that signed a treaty with the US in the Horn of Africa, and its foreign policy had been greatly influenced by the US. To this end, the role of Ethiopia was very important in the process of deterring the communist expansion. Furthermore, the participation of Ethiopia in the Korean and Congo crises had have much more correlation with the US national interests and the influence that the US foreign policy had exerted on the Ethiopian foreign policy.

Even though, Ethiopia's foreign policy had been pro American, the country unlike many dependent states of the world had acted uniquely and had enter played a crucial role over the great powers including the US. Accordingly, Ethiopia had used the British forces over the Italian fascists to evict the later from Ethiopia. Etiopia had also used the US superior and hegemonic position to challenge the British domination. Moreover, Ethiopia had also played the

Soviet card against the Americans. These diplomatic maneuvers signify the prudence of Ethiopia's diplomacy especially during the time of Haile Selassie. Ethiopia's strategic position had also been among the important factors to attract the US foreign policy towards Ethiopia.

2.5. The Foreign Policy of a Dependent State

According to Bruce E. Moon, the dependency theory in general explores the process by which the foreign policy of a weak nation comes to reflect the preference of more powerful nations. He further notes that there are two general conceptions of the nature of this process: the bargaining and the dependency models. In the bargaining model the most common conception of the influence relationship suggest that powerful nations secure the cooperation of weaker states chiefly through the use of reward and punishment behaviors. The reward behavior most frequently identified is military aid and economic assistance. Trade and investment have also been considered as reward behaviors. The use of force, threat of force, boycott, and sanction can be taken as punishment behaviors (Moon, 1983:317).

The other model which is a dependency model perspective influence, conceptualizes the link as a longer term structural relationship in which the opportunity for the weak state and the necessity for more powerful state to engage in bargaining is severely limited. In this model, the stronger state imposes a familiar characterization mechanism on the weaker state. The familiar characterization helps the stronger state to attain a significant alteration on the policy of the weak state without a chance of any bargaining relationship. That means, through the process of familiar characterization a weak state is presumed to comply with the policies of the stronger nation. In this model, the weaker state does not have the opportunity to bargain for its compliance towards the interest of the stronger state (Moon, 1983:320).

Ethiopia's dependence on super powers has been a long-lived phenomenon. In the mid of the 16th century when a dangerous Muslim invasion was waged against Ethiopia, Ethiopia had sought assistance from the European great powers by which that dangerous invasion was resisted and was defeated" (Clapham, 1988:221). The above statement is a good indication of the long extended dependence of Ethiopia on a foreign assistance for its security. However, it should be noted that Ethiopia also has had a remarkable history of resisting and defeating external forces merely by her own capacity and autonomous action.

2.6. Chapter Summary

The theory of political realism has served as one of the dominant schools of thought particularly, during the Cold War period. Political realism is basically contrary to the other school of thought-the theory of idealism. The theory of realism believes in that international relations are the struggle for power. According to this theory national security of states is determined by the level of the military capacity of states. That means states with a relatively better military might are able to defend themselves and to defeat their rivals.

Most of the activities that the US has been carrying out since the end of the Second World War are actions that are very much related to the ideas of the realist theory. The establishment of the US bases at different parts of the world, changes that the US makes in the alignment of forces, the new military technologies that the US strives for, the different military operations that the US accomplishes in different parts of the world are good indications for the application of the theory of realism in the American political and military practices.

Ethiopia's rulers have also adopted the theory of realism in their exercise of defending the national security and territorial integrity of the country. The incessant arms requests of Haile Selassie from the US to balance the threat of Somalia, to withhold the secessionist practices in Eritrea, and to defeat the insurgency in the Ogaden region are exercises that could be related to the idea of the theory of realism. The aspiration of the Derg to build a military capacity that excels the forces in the Horn of Africa was also the idea very much associated with the theory of realism. The present day will of the EPRDF led government to strengthen its military capacity and to withstand the threat from Eritrea and international terrorism is the idea that finds its roots in the theory of realism because; the whole notion of realism presupposes the surpassing of one's military capacity than a contending force in order to put away the will of the enemy and to defeat that enemy.

The concept of national interest implies the massive interests of a nation. National interest excels all individual interests of groups within the country and that of other nations. The national interest of a country cannot be over ridden by the interests of any other bodies internal or external. It is the most crucial element in the design of a foreign policy because; foreign policy pursues to achieve the national interests of a nation. International relations likewise are

also presumed to chase the objectives of the goals of a foreign policy. In this regard there is a great link and correlation among the three.

Foreign policy is a guide that states formulate based on internal and external conditions. Although, the formulation of a foreign policy is supposed to follow the above line of argument, the formulation of the Ethiopian foreign policy had not followed the above notion. Just like many dependent states, Ethiopia's foreign policy had been influenced and pressured by friendly and unfriendly countries. This happened because of the felt and actual threats that were posed from the nearby and far away countries and other elements as well.

The foreign policy of the United States remained an isolationist one until the time the US joined the Second World War. Its policy underwent a radical change since the Second World War. This time the US abandoned its isolationist policy and followed an active policy, which it believed was a protectorate of democracy. This radical change fortunately brought the US closer to Ethiopia. And the two countries signed agreements. This condition brought the two countries to work side by side on the issues of their national interests.

The foreign policy of a dependent state prefers to comply with the interest of more power full nations. This results from the punishment and reward behaviors exercised by power full nations over smaller states. Weak states are also induced by the reward and punishment behaviors of the more power full states. This practice is related to the bargaining model of the dependency theory. The other exercise refers to the dependency model, which is characterized by long term structural relationship. This model assumes that stronger states impose a familiar characterization mechanism on weaker states. Accordingly the policy of the weaker state is forced to comply with the policy of the stronger state. This model does not give a chance to the weak state to bargain for its compliance towards the interests of the stronger states.

Chapter Three: A Brief History of Ethio-US Security Relationships

3.1. Introduction

This chapter aims at examining and assessing the historical perspective of the relations between the two countries. In doing so, the factors of the relations between the two countries are examined in order to find out the roles these factors have played in the process of the interactions between the two states. Some factors have played a positive role and others have their negative impacts on the relations between the two countries. In line with these roles and impacts the relationships have been examined and assessed to check whether the relations were either pleasant and/or frosty. Following this condition it has also been checked that whether Ethiopia and the US have benefited from their relations over the decades. Since the objective of the research is to come up with the factors of changes and continuities in the Ethio-US security relationships, the assessment that this chapter has made has facilitated the condition for chapter four to identify and judge as which factors of relations contributed to the changes and as which played part to the continuities of the relationships. In this regard, the role of the chapter has been very important in addressing the problem that the research is interested to deal with. As regard to the relationship between the previous and the current chapters, the previous chapter assesses the conceptual and theoretical framework of the Ethio-US relations whereas the current chapter utilizes and applies those concepts in assessing the historical perspective of the relations.

3.2. The Informal Relations Prior to 1903

The relationships between Ethiopia and the United States are one of the oldest ties that Ethiopia has established in its diplomatic history. This relationship chronologically holds the fifth place following the relations of four European nations with Ethiopia namely: Italy, France, Great Britain and the USSR respectively (Taye, 2010:108). Nonetheless, Ethio-US relationships are the most fundamental and crucial diplomatic contacts that have been playing a central role in the international relations of Ethiopia.

Given the high level of degree that Ethio- American relationships have been playing in the socio-political conditions of the former, it would be very imperative that these relations of the two countries should be examined and analyzed. Thusly, that is what this chapter is going to

attempt all about. To this end, the first and principal task to be dealt here is to address the query as when these relationships came into existence. In answering this question, Negussay reacts in two dimensions and writes as under:

The answer to this timely question invites a nuanced treatment of the subject. If one considers only formal diplomatic track of relations, the answer is December 1903. However, if one follows informal and people to people, commercial, and even military contacts, the answer is quite different (Negussay, 2003:120).

The first reaction of Negussay implies the specific time of the commencement of the formal diplomatic bondage between the two countries. Or in other words, he stipulates the time when state to state relationships started and he also lays down the actual timing of the beginning of this contact to December 27, 1903. His second response deals with the informal relationships between the two countries, which refer to people to people, commercial, and other forms of contacts. Nigussay does not provide a hard and fast time to the beginning of these relationships. Nevertheless, there is a general consensus among scholars about the occurrence of such informal relationships between the two countries prior to the inauguration of the formal Ethio-US diplomatic ties. The next statement by Nigussay explains about the events in this informal relationship particularly the role, belief, and attitude that African-Americans had. The statement reads as follows:

In the minds of the peoples of African descent at large Ethiopia symbolized their collective entitlement, supplication to God, their eternal redemption as well as their emblem of identity, liberty, and dignity wherever they are (Negussay, 2003:19).

As it has been associated by the premises above, such perception and attitude found its roots in the presence of the name Ethiopia in the Holy Bible. To this end, Taye (2010: 6) tells that “Ethiopia is a country whose name is mentioned about forty times in the holy bible.” Other scholars also share the same notion of this perception, with which African Americans had established a very strong affiliation to Ethiopia. The following statements clearly uphold this argument and also provide the extension of this belief throughout the centuries when Getachew (2009:13) writes as follows: “Some African-Americans who profess Ethiopianism have historically looked up to Ethiopia. Its long history, culture, and divination in the Old Testament have made Ethiopia attractive especially to Diaspora.” In line with this notion, African

Americans had established a very strong affiliation with Ethiopia, first as an idea and latter as a reality to which they have aligned their decent and historical ties to the country. Negussay (003:19) explains the situation as under:

In time Ethioianism developed in to a set of beliefs and mantra symbolizing redemption, liberty, solidarity, pride and hope for all blacks in Africa and Diaspora. There was extensive and worth mentioning sense of awareness and bodying with Ethiopia by African Americans going back to the days of slavery, and continuing extensively through the 19th century and beyond. A few other Americans notably soldiers of fortune did show up in Ethiopia also as a latter part of the 19th century. There was some trade going on between the two countries at the threshold of the 20th century but no political and diplomatic contacts yet.

In his explanation above, Negussay also mentions that there were some business transactions between the two countries prior to the establishment of the formal diplomatic relationships. Getachew also mentions about the contacts of the American citizens with Ethiopia before the time the formal diplomatic relationships between the two countries came in to effect.

Individual US citizens went to Ethiopia for a verity of reasons. In the late 19th century, Hennery M. Stanley, a special correspondent for New York Herald accompanied the British expedition under Sir Robert Napier (1868) and witnessed the fall of Makadala and the death of Emperor Tewodros (Getachew, 2009:13).

There is an important point to be examined here. In addition to his task of disseminating the news of the conflict, the presence of Hennery M. Stanley with the British forces in Ethiopia, clearly shows or asserts that the mission of the British forces was acknowledged by the United States or by its agencies. In other words, it can be said that the illegal and outlawed military operation of the Great Britain against an independent and sovereign Ethiopia had have the blessings of the other super powers- an act that really pains anyone who has got a concern about the rights and sovereignty of nations.

When we come back to our main subject matter, the authors indicated above have tried their best to show the subsistence of the informal relationships that existed between the two countries prior to 1903. As we shall see it in the upcoming pages of this chapter, the unceremonious or informal relationships of the two countries had profoundly contributed to the commencement of

the official diplomatic contacts between Ethiopia and the United States. And it is possible to say that they were the basis in this regard.

The informal diplomatic ties, which found their roots in the years that extended into the times of slavery, are events that must deserve admiration. This is so because; the events took place at the time when the means of communications were at their rudimentary levels, or one can say were very backward. In addition to that, the distance between the two countries was so enormous that it would have been a barrier for their communications. However, regardless of these challenges the informal diplomatic ties had existed for so long. This relationship is a good indication for how much decent and blood ties are so magnetic in the relations of human beings. This argument had been evidenced by such an old contact that had been exercised between the peoples that resided far away from each other in different continents- in the Horn of Africa and North America. Such affiliation of African Americans towards Ethiopia is something to be considered very essential for the present relations between the two. Such an exercise of African Americans have to be cultivated and upheld by the present day formal diplomatic exercise and as well as by people to people relations in order to make the most out of such a practice.

This old notion of progeny of African Americans for Africa in general and to Ethiopia in particular is further accentuated by archeological findings such as Lucy and other similar results of investigations, which are believed to be the ancestors of all humanity. Such archeological findings and others will further underscore the idea that African Americans up held and brought to the scene many years back. In this vein, much has to be done by Ethiopians and Ethiopian Americans to reinstitute that glorious thought and attitude of the past. If such people to people relationship is taken in to consideration and dealt seriously, it can even give a boost to the formal diplomatic ties of the two countries. And this can address the gaps that the formal relationships fail to tackle. Thus, those who have the opportunity to make it must do their level best endeavor to restore and to maintain that idea of African Americans as much as possible.

3.3. Commencement and Move of the Formal Diplomatic Relationships

Just the beginning of the twentieth century comes to lay the basis for the up rise of the formal diplomatic ties between Ethiopia and the United States. As it has been mentioned in the pages over, the informal contacts between the two countries had given impetus to the embryo of the ceremonious relationships to take roots and grow. Most notably, the event that brought Ras

Mekonnen of Ethiopia and William H. Ellis of the United States together was a breakthrough for its emergence. Those individuals, who met in London to attend the coronation of King Edward VII, acquainted to each other and eventually during their stay in London Ras Mekonnen advanced his invitation to Mr. Ellis to visit Ethiopia. Mr. Ellis promptly accepted the invitation and arrived in Ethiopia in the mid of October 1903. Although, the United States did not give Ellis' mission affirmation, major contemporary press in New York including New York World, New York Tribune as well as others in the United States and also in Britain covered his trip abundantly (Negussay 2003:42). According to the same author again, Ellis briefed about his trip to Ethiopia and what he observed in the country to one of his friends as follows:

The country I am informed is very rich in its minerals, and agriculturally, and its resources are wonderful, but are vastly in need of development material. ...The people have governed themselves for hundreds of years and are of religious nature. ... I believe partially through my efforts I have succeeded in getting the United States to establish connections with the country. Thus, Americans may have an opportunity to assist in developing the country. The president of the United States and Secretary Hay are especially interested in looking to the securing of a treaty between the United States and Ethiopia (Negussay 2003:43).

Mr. Ellis, one can argue was an African American who had a positive attitude towards Ethiopia and its people. He had narrated about the independence and self government of the people. He had also highlighted about the spiritual character of the Ethiopian society. Above all, he had promoted about the resources of the country. He had identified and envisioned the deep rooted desire of development in the country. He had as well urged the United States to assist the development needs of Ethiopia. Furthermore, he also had pushed the US officials to establish ties with Ethiopia.

Most of his words seem to show his high concern for Ethiopia and its interests. Although, diplomacy is a give and take art of interaction, he mainly underscored about the interests of Ethiopia to be served through the diplomatic relationship he envisaged to take place. His view of points seemed very friendly to Ethiopia and sympathetic to the needs that the country wanted very badly. This is why Nigussay (2003:44) vindicates Ellis in the following words: "Ellis puts his finger on the proposition that became the foreign policy linchpin of Ethiopian rulers, vis-à-vis the United States from 1903 throughout the regime of Emperor Haile Silasie." To this end, it

is likely possible to say that Ellis must be admired and rated as the first architect of the relationship between Ethiopia and the United States. Getachew (2009:14) also commends Ellis for his contribution in the process of forging Ethio- American relations as follows: “In the diplomatic arena, Ellis convinced Menelik to enter into a treaty of amity and commerce with the United States, which served as a corner stone to forge an official relationship between the two countries.” As mentioned earlier, in spite of the existence of different contacts between Ethiopia and the US such as trade and others, there were no state to state relations until the end of the nineteenth century.

The opening of relations between the two countries was actually addressed by another American figure who resided in Europe namely Mr. Skinner. The following statement tells about the role of this individual:” The proposal to ameliorate this yawning gap in relations came from Robert P. Skinner the United States Consul General in Marseilles”(Negussay, 2003:41) . One may wonder how Mr. Skinner who had been positioned in a very far away country from Ethiopia came to visualize the need for the establishment of relations between the US and Ethiopia. Just right from the information available about it, Mr. Skinner was interested in the expansion of the trade of the United States in the Horn region and Ethiopia. Accordingly, he was able to envision Ethiopia as the most favorable country for the accomplishment of that business advantage in the region. Thus, we can safely argue that Mr. Skinner’s insight by large and far was associated with the American business benefit and it was his business mindedness that initiated him to perceive the idea. Getachew’s (2009:14) statements support this argument:

In his letter to David Hill Assistant Secretary of State, Skinner States that, there is a field of study and commerce expansion in Africa that is deserving of consideration. In Abyssinia the US maintained not even the semblance of official representation although there exists, a vast population, politically independent, and capable of absorbing our products.

According to Getachew, Mr. Skinner while proposing the establishment of the amity and commercial relationships between the two countries, he had associated his idea to the size of the population and as well as to the political independence and sovereignty of Ethiopia. That means the sovereignty of Ethiopia had played a great role in attracting Skinner’s perception of establishing ties of formal relationship between the two countries. Had Ethiopia been one of the victims of European colonialism, Skinner’s argument might have lacked validity when he was

trying to lobby his superiors. Negussay also underscores the deep rooted business interest of Skinner, which served as a pillar for the proposal that he presented to his government. Negussay (2003:46) puts it in the following words:

What Skinner wanted to do was to expand and secure such trade between the two countries through legal and political sanction. He argued that business in general and American business in particular in regions astride the Red Sea and that it was essential for the Americans to have official representation there to facilitate and protect American commercial the region will preclude the probability of attaining substantial commercial relations between the US and Ethiopia.

As one can apparently learn from the above premises, Mr. Skinner was highly concerned about the establishment and protection of US trade interests in the Horn Region. He also wanted the diplomatic contacts to take place as soon as possible. His urge was mainly due to the presence of the European factions in the area. He was worried about their being there because; if the actions of establishing relations were delayed, the European colonial powers may take a counter action that could prevent US contacts with Ethiopia.

The point here is that, just as Menelik was threatened by the presence of the European forces that were stationed around his country as a threat to his nation's security, Skinner was also inconvenient about their presence there in the region. Thus, we can make an inference that both Ethiopia and the United States were concerned and worried about the presence of the colonial cabals around Ethiopia. In the final analysis, the immediate establishment of relations between the two nations became a prompt necessity for both America and Ethiopia.

Both Mr. Ellis and Mr. Skinner had made their level best efforts to materialize the formal diplomatic contacts between Ethiopia and the United States. However, there was a difference in their approach. That means Mr. Ellis mainly related his idea to the Ethiopian interests. That is, the assistance of the US to the development of Ethiopian resources. On the other hand, Mr. Skinner profoundly underscored his reasoning on the American commercial interest that he thought was very essential and basic to the national interest of his country. The other dissimilarity between the two personalities was that, Mr. Skinner's effort was an official exercise for he was an American official who represented his government; where as Mr. Ellis'

endeavor was a private exercise, which was initiated by a privately interest. Nonetheless, both of them hold a very important place in the history of Ethiopian-American relationships.

In addition, when dealing with the history of Ethio-US diplomatic relations, one should not lose of sight Emperor Menelik II who had acted as a trained diplomatic figure in the process of building such an important relationship between the United States of America and Ethiopia. The effort of the emperor was very much associated to his desire to modernize and develop the country. Getachew (2009:20) writes about the Emperor's role in the following manner: "The architect of modern Ethiopia, Emperor Menelik had been instrumental in establishing the relationship between Ethiopia and the United States as he wanted the modernization and the protection of his country." Furthermore, the reception and hospitality performed to the American mission of 1903, in Ethiopia was a good case in point that well indicated the diplomatic skill and his enthusiasm in materializing the contact between the two states. Negussay (2003:49) explains that magnificent event in the following expression:

The most important and spectacular aspect of this first official American mission was the way it was received by the people and government of Ethiopia. No other foreign mission before or after was accorded such warmth, enthusiasm, lavish, hospitality and color full pomp and pageantry every day of its stay, as was the American mission led by Commissioner Skinner in December 1903.

The above statement clearly shows the high regard and special attention given by Emperor Menelik to the contact that he was to make with the US. The point this paper would like to underscore here at this point is, given the time he lived and administered the county, Menelik's diplomatic exercise seemed to be an act that took place ahead of its time.

When one examines the role played by Mr. Skinner in bringing his idea to the ground, he was a very much determined and was a dedicated man. In this vein, his relentless lobbying and pressure finally obtained a positive response from President Theodor Roosevelt. The president appointed Skinner as his commissioner for the commercial/ diplomatic mission to the Court of Emperor Menelik. Commissioner Skinner left Marseilles on 25 October 1903 and arrived in Addis Ababa in less than two months. His mission comprised 28 persons and he was a head for the commission. Commissioner Skinner was pleased by the hospitality he was rendered at his reception in Ethiopia. The following explanation describes the Ethiopian feeling that Mr.

Skinner sensed concerning the Ethio-US diplomatic ties at that time and Negussay (2003:49) puts it as under:

Commissioner Skinner noted that the Ethiopian's genuinely appreciated the development of an alliance of friendship of foreign power that was devoid of discussion of frontiers and protectorates. He added that, there was popular conviction that American friendship had no dangers, and would be a source of moral strength to the nation.

The idea of Commissioner Skinner mentioned above mainly focuses on the Ethiopian attitude that they were suspicious of European colonial powers. On the contrast, his opinion indicates that such inconvenience was not attributed to the Americans because; the American history did not show any interest of colonizing other nations.

Skinner's view also mentioned that American friendship with Ethiopia was a source of moral strength to Ethiopians. However, this philosophy which presumed the relations of the two countries to be moral strength and confidence for the Ethiopian people, as we shall see it in the upcoming pages was not fulfilled by the Americans. When Ethiopia was brutally invaded and occupied by the fascist Italy forces in 1936, the trust of the Ethiopian people on the US was lost. Be that as it may, eventually the treaty of amity and commerce was dually written in Amharic, English, and French and Emperor Menelik and Envoy Skinner signed and affixed seals to the treaty on December 27, 1903. Getachew (2009:14) stipulates about the signing of the treaty in the following vocabulary:

Skinner's initiative gained support and on December 27, 1903 a treaty of amity and commerce which comprises seven articles was signed between Emperor Menelik and Robert P. Skinner. The treaty regulates commercial relations between the two countries and also accorded Ethiopia the status of most favored nations (MFN), paving the way, for the eventual diplomatic relationship of Ethiopia and the United States.

In this regard, the treaty of amity and commerce can be said was the corner stone for the relationship of the two countries, which proved to be one of the most important diplomatic ties and that have played the most crucial role in the Ethio-US security relationships for more than a century. However, at times the relationships have suffered from some ups and downs in due course.

Referring to the attitude of Emperor Menelik in connection to the Ethio-US diplomatic ties Getachew (2009:19) observes as follows:

Emperor Menelik II, despite the antagonism of the European powers, was open to the US and saw it as counter force to the Europeans, especially to Britain, France, and Italy, as he was suspicious of their ulterior motives and their colonial history.

Emperor Menelik was rightly suspicious of the European colonial powers. This was so because; his trust and belief was betrayed by the Italian fascist rulers in the Wuchalie Treaty of 1889. Negussay accounts to the point of his distrust that the Wuchalie treaty had brought to the Emperor when he writes: "The fearful fraud committed by the Italian colonialists in the Wuchallie Treaty and its aftermath had made Menelik once beaten twice shy" (Negussay, 2003:51). As a result, this condition had forced the Emperor and his advisors to go between lines when they were checking the draft of the 1903 Treaty.

Consequent to this event, the approval of the 1903 Ethio-US Treaty took its course of event and finally was signed by the Senate of the United States of America. The following statements give the details about the signing and the opening of the US legation in Addis Ababa Getachew (2009:19):

The US senate ratified the 1903 Treaty (article 1-7) on March 12, 1904, and it was signed by President Theodor Roosevelt, just five days later, on March 17, 1904. The US legation was opened in Addis Ababa on December 19, 1906, after Frank R. Mower was at the first consul general that August.

Gradually, although much was expected from the relations of the two countries especially by the Ethiopians, despite the continued growth of trade the progress of the diplomatic relationships was slow and halting. Mean while, the three European colonial powers that were not comfortable about the coming of the United States to the region and particularly about her relations with Ethiopia, prepared and signed a Tripartite Treaty without the knowledge of the Ethiopian Government. This action of the European powers, which was not made apparent to the country upon which the treaty was to be executed was said to have been associated to the concern of the European colonial powers regarding the newly concluded Ethic-US relations. Negussay (2003:58) discloses the assumption behind the formulation of the tripartite treaty in the following terminology:

Even though, it was not publicly acknowledged by the parties to the tripartite treaty in Ethiopia, it is possible one of the reasons for their action was some concern as to what was developing American presence in Ethiopia may portend for their hegemony in the regime. For its part the United States did not make any public statement on the tripartite treaty and its consequences to their new found trade and diplomatic relationship in the north east Africa.

As we can learn from Negussay's statement above and from the point of view of sovereign Ethiopia, the tripartite treaty could be measured as the violation of the rights and independence of the country. Since the treaty was prepared and signed merely by the three European colonial powers without the consent of Ethiopia, their action was undoubtedly against the national interest of Ethiopia. The United States, which had signed the treaty of amity and commerce with Ethiopia, would have not looked to this action indifferently. The coldness of the American government on this issue- a matter that was very dangerous to the Ethiopian national security might have induced the later to suspect as if there was a hidden agreement between the United States and the three European powers. The then silence of the United States on the tripartite treaty is an issue that requires further study and examination in order to have a clear understanding about the substance of the theme.

In the years that followed, the relations between the two countries did not go well in accordance to the needs and desires of the Ethiopian government. Although the Ethiopian government did its level best effort to enhance the relationship, the response from the American part was not an encouraging one. However, Ras Teferi had tried to preserve the relationship as much as possible. Negussay (2003:80) states the condition as under: "Whatever the ups and downs of the situation, Ras Teferi continued to campaign for a stable American presence in Ethiopia." Mainly since the 1930s and up until the mid of the same decade, the United States took measures that further weakened the relations. Particularly, in the year 1934, the US made a decision that down scaled the status of the American Embassy in Ethiopia. The following statement given by Negussay (2003:98) well depicts that act as under:

In fact as early as 1934 the United States, had downgraded its diplomatic presence in Addis Ababa by withdrawing Minister Addison and replacing him with a charge de affairs (ad interim) there by hinting at terminating American presence in Ethiopia all together.

The mid 1930s was the time at which the Italian Fascist forces were preparing to invade Ethiopia. The United States as a country that had diplomatic as well as commercial relationships with Ethiopia was supposed to inform and assist the later to defend itself from the upcoming invasion. To the contrary, the US passed a Neutrality Act in August 1935. This resolution was considered by others as an act made by the US to deliberately keep aloof her from the eventually rising problems. Conversely, in the mean time the United States was selling oil to fascist Italy. (Negussay, 2003) defends the above argument in the following expression: “The United states was in fact selling oil to Italy at this time knowing full well the strategic military importance of the commodity.” That was a good proof of that the US was not deterred by the Neutrality Act from involving in the event that was taking place between Ethiopia and fascist Italy. The statement here under further exemplifies the participation that the US under went in the violence that the Italians were committing against Ethiopia’s sovereignty (Negussay2003:99).

Professor John H. Spencer relates that just he and other Americans were getting prepared to evacuate from Addis Ababa on the eve of 5 May 1936, he saw the dispatches sent by US Secretary of State Cordell Hull to Mussolini urging him to have his forces enter Addis Ababa swiftly.

Now, the point is that if the US preferred to be neutral, why was she worried about the quick takeover of Addis Ababa by the fascist forces? Here, one can argue that the Neutrality Act was just put in effect as a covert act and to dissociate Ethiopia away and not to allow it any appeal to the US government; and thereby to deny any assistance in any form to Ethiopia. Nonetheless, the Ethiopian people were left to be the victims of fascist Italy and to shoulder the repression of fascism for a solid of five years, miserably and helplessly to the worst of its scenario.

3.4. Ethio-US Relations in the Post Occupation Era

3.4.1. Relations with the Haile Selassie Regime

Emperor Haile Selassie, who had been in exile for almost five years had made his level best diplomatic efforts to retain the sovereignty of the country and his imperial authority. His endeavor added to the relentless struggle of the Ethiopian people particularly, the Ethiopian patriot’s attack on the fascist forces, consequently resulted in evicting the aggressor Italian fascism from Ethiopia. The support of the British forces was also of immense help to the

restoration of the power of the Emperor and the sovereignty of the country. Although, Haile Selassie was able to return home with dignity and to restore his authority, the British forces that had helped him to come home were not ready to hand over the administration of his country to the Emperor. For that matter, he was not an authorized leader of his nation. (Marcus, 1995:8) explains that inopportune circumstance as under:

Haile Selassie was an emperor among his people but he was not yet a ruler in Addis Ababa, occupied in April 1941 by the British, who had immediately established a military administration for what they considered occupied enemy territory. This time was a bittersweet moment for the emperor.

The British forces who were close partners with fascist Italy in the scramble for Africa seemed to take the place of the Italian occupation over Ethiopia. This had clearly been manifested through their institutionalization of a military administration and their reluctance to allow the Emperor to exercise his complete power over the entire nation. This condition had created a dual sense of feeling upon the Emperor. On one hand, he was happy for restoring his authority and independence of the country. On the other, he had been resented by the act of the British armed forces for they were not ready to hand over a full-fledged power and authority to him. Nevertheless, the Emperor did not sit idle until the British forces allowed him to exercise his sovereign authority. Since the time he reached in Ethiopia, he had started to take his own measures of reinstating his administration. To this end, Marcus (1995:9) states the Emperor's action as follows: "The emperor of course, was guided by his own political needs; as soon as he set foot in Ethiopia in February 1941, he started to restore loyal provincial and local governments."

As one can apparently grasp from the actions of the British military forces and Haile Selassie's reaction, the situation was not smooth, rather it could be said was fractious. This condition forced Haile Selassie to find a means to resolve the problem he was encountered by. Thusly, he started to seek support from the United States though he was not helped by the United States during the invasion and occupation of the country by fascist forces. Nonetheless, this time the Americans appeared to sympathize with his problems. Schraeder (1996:118) explains in the following words:

Ever since the defeat of the Italian fascist in 1941 and Britain's establishment of highly resented military administration over Ethiopian territory, the emperor had sought the US support in reasserting Ethiopian national sovereignty. Of greatest importance to Haile Selassie was the creation of the US – Ethiopian security relationship, in which the US was to serve as a primary benefactor for the expansion and modernization of the Ethiopian armed forces.

The emperor had been previously scared by the brutal invasion of fascist Italy of 1936. He had also been threatened by the presence of the colonial powers around Ethiopia. For that matter, he was in need to establishing a modern military force. Accordingly, he was obliged to seek the support of the US to materialize his objective. Consequently, his effort resulted in a positive gesture from the United States and was also able to reinstitute the Ethio–US relations that had been dismantled by the fascist invasion of Ethiopia (Schraeder 1996:118).

The other important point to be noted here at this particular juncture is the prudent diplomatic skill of Haile Selassie. Just to come to the point, he had used the American assistance to challenge the British unwillingness to allow him to administer his country with a full -flagged sovereign authority. That means he was able to play one super power over the other. It is also very important to note that the Emperor was helped by the British to oust the fascist enemy previously.

As regard to the support of the United States to Ethiopia, which could be said was contrary to the interest of the Great Britain, a question could be raised as why the US took such a position. Just to reflect to this point, the issue was a matter of national interest. Although the two super powers were fighting as allies in the Second World War, the United States was mainly attracted towards the Horn Region based on its own national interest at the time because, the involvement of the United States in the Second World War had increased the importance of the Horn of Africa. This condition of course came to happen as a result of East-West division in the international system. The statement written by Schraeder (1996:15) here under supports the notion:

Strategic necessities associated with expanding involvement in World War II laid the foundation of US foreign policy towards the Horn of Africa. In an effort to oppose military expansionism of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, the Roosevelt administration declared Ethiopia for inclusion in military aid program known as “Lend Lease”, in March 1941.

According to Schraeder's point of view, the foreign policy of the United States was very much induced towards the Horn of Africa and as well to Ethiopia to materialize the US goal that she had targeted in the Horn Region. Furthermore, the different interests of the United States that prevailed in Ethiopia had also helped the latter to obtain assistance from the former. From the Ethiopian part the assistance was meant to calm down the tension that Ethiopia was facing from Great Britain. Marcus (1995:15) explains the situation in the following words:

Ethiopia then would qualify for "Lend Lease" not only advertising Washington's interest in the rehabilitation of liberated countries, but also facilitated a resumption of trade between the United States and Ethiopia and opening the way for American interest to share in the development of resources in Ethiopia after the war. Finally, permitting Ethiopia to join the United Nations was considered by the state department to be a friendly gesture which might prove a valuable asset after the war to American air lines desiring to operate across Ethiopia which lies in path of probable air route to India and the Far East.

According to the above premises, it is likely possible to argue that the United States sympathized with the problems of Ethiopia and extended her support to the later mainly for the sake of her own interests that were envisaged in Ethiopia to be materialized after the end of the Second World War. Furthermore, the support and encouragement that was rendered by the US to Ethiopia to become the member of the United Nations, was believed to be a reward to the later and to strengthen the relationship between Ethiopia and the US.

As Ethiopia became more close to the United States, Haile Selasie's need for American weapons was highly increased; and the request for US arms was very much incessant. In addition to his request through different diplomatic mechanisms, the emperor also sent his trusted Vice Minister of Finance Yilma Deressa to the United States. Marcus (1995:18) explains this mission:

Haile Selasie sent Lij Yilma Deresa, a trusted official to the United States, ostensibly to participate in the international conference on food, but in reality to negotiate a lend lease agreement. ... after indirectly drawing attention to the British encirclement of his nation, the vice minister defined his request for armaments as inconsequential to the United States, but for Ethiopia's armed forces it would be a source of moral and material strength in the event of threat of invasion.

At that time Ethiopia was encircled and was also threatened by the British forces that had been placed in the colonies of the latter around Ethiopia. Accordingly, Haile Selasie's request was partly related to this tension and partly to his needs to defy other aggressions. In his address Yilma underscored that the military assistance of the US would also be the basis for the Ethiopian armed forces; the phrase that the vice minister applied to motivate the United States towards his country's objectives. A prudent diplomatic approach!

Yilma Deresa not only addressed Ethiopia's vital need of arms to the US, he as well appealed to the US assistance in other areas of the problems of the country. (Marcus, 1995:19) uses the following expression to explain Yilma's request: "Then Yilma invited a peaceful American attack on Ethiopia's many problems." In the communiqué that took place between the officials of the two countries, the issue of an outlet to the sea had been a matter of high concern to Ethiopia. In the contacts and discussions that followed, the incorporation of Eritrea in to Ethiopia was brought to the fore front by Emperor Haile Selasie.

The US State Department of the near eastern and African affairs was also concerned about the status of Eritrea. The department was worried about it because, independent Eritrea was assumed to result in the creation of a weak state which would be exposed to Soviet aggression or infiltration. In the final, among from the different alternatives that were envisaged for the future of Eritrea, the incorporation of the territory under the Ethiopian sovereignty was the concluding agreement that was reached by the US National security Bureaucracies. Schraeder (1996:117) makes clear the agreement when he says: "New consensus within the national security Bureaucracies favored guaranteeing Ethiopian control over the entire Eritrean territory." Even though the United States had its own agenda in bringing Eritrea under the sovereign authority of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie's apt diplomatic argument and his persuasive reasoning was also worth noting. (Marcus, 1995:51) states this skilful line of reasoning as under:

The emperor said from a short term point of view, Djibouti would be the best port because of the existing rail way, but that a long term policy required a port in Eritrea. The memorandum claiming the Italian colony was not based solely upon the ground necessity for economic reasons or for equally pressing and vital need for access to the sea, but on the history: before record time, Eritrea and its inhabitants have been an integral part of Ethiopia.

Haile Selassie's argument in the last resort brought to the fore the historical bondage of Ethiopia and the Eritrean territory and as well the close ties that persisted among the peoples of the two territories since the time immemorial. Accordingly his argument was so firm that no one could rule it out by a logical and acceptable reasoning. Thusly, his argument was well taken and was impressive enough to convince all those that were involved in the matter.

The Americans also had their own sounding reasons for bringing Eritrea under the Ethiopian administration. They believed that neither Italian trusteeship nor independence of Eritrea would serve the American objective of establishing a base in Asmara. Particularly, independence was rejected by the policy makers of the US, who believed that an economically unviable Eritrea would be subject or would fall a prey to communist aggression. Thusly, the Americans voted for the alternative that could enable them to have access over Eritrea. Schraeder (1996:118) argues as under to this end: "The primary driving force behind those conclusions was the firm belief that every effort had to be made to assure the maintenance of essential US military rights in Eritrea, particularly in Asmara- Massawa area"

The Kagnaw military base had been the most crucial factor in determining the Ethio-US relationships. The base had greatly influenced the support of the United States in the process of incorporating Eritrea with Ethiopia. It had also been a vital source of US military assistance to Ethiopia. As it has been mentioned in the pages above, the incorporation of Eritrea under the sovereignty of Ethiopia was by large facilitated by the support of the United States. Had it not been for the support of the US, the history of Eritrea would have been written in a different form than it happened to be. Thus, it is likely possible to say that Kagnaw's role had been very great in determining the fate of Eritrea after the end of the fascist Italian colonial rule in Eritrea (Clapham, 1998:222).

For the mutual benefits that the US and Ethiopia had in Eritrea and particularly for the vital interests the United States had on Kagnaw and other military facilities, the United States fully supported the incorporation of Eritrea with Ethiopia. Marcus summarizes that historic support to Ethiopia and the interest of the US in Eritrea in the following terminology:

Not surprisingly, therefore, in November 1948, Secretary of State George Marshall offered to support Addis Ababa's claim, to most of Eritrea, in return for unhampered use of the radio station in Asmara and possibly other military

facilities such as air fields and ports in the Asmara- Massawa area (Marcus, 1995:84).

The eventual negotiations that took place between the US and Ethiopia, finally, led to the signing of an agreement that asserted the use of the Kagnew station to the US and other facilities in Eritrea. The agreement was signed for twenty five years. The agreement also carried over the grant of weapons and other equipments from the US to Ethiopia. The substance of the agreement is explicated by Lefebvre (1998:616):

On 25 may 1953, the United States and Ethiopia signed an agreement governing the use of Kagnew station and other facilities in Eritrea until 1978; and a standard military assistance treaty regulating the delivery of weapons and other equipments and providing for the Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG).

Another scholar Schraeder (1996:119) also provides his brief reflections on the condition of the military agreements of 1953 between the United States and Ethiopia as under:

In an effort to force the military assistance issue, negotiations were demanded after the aftermath of Ethiopia's acquisition of Eritrea in 1952 to determine the official status of the US presence at Asmara barracks named Kagnew station. The resolution of all outstanding bargaining issues resulted in signing to US-Ethiopia military agreement in May 1953.

Despite the signing of agreements to provide an all round military assistance to Ethiopia, only very little was done in practice by the US. Thus, the Emperor on his first visit to the United States made his level best effort to press the US Congress in his address in a joint session with the Congress. Marcus (1995:92) elucidates the appeal of the emperor:

The emperor opened the campaign on his first visit to the United States in spring 1954. In an address before a joint session of congress, he remarked, "we have a profound orientation to the west.... We read the same bible. We speak a common spiritual tongue. So great are your power, and wealth that the budget of a single American city often equals, that of an entire nation. More to the point he declared his intention to remark Ethiopia through the closest possible association with the United States.

Although very diplomatic and inspiring was the emperor in his communiqué to the congress, he made no a difference in substance. So, the US military aid process went under the same reluctant due course of action. Marcus states what the then foreign minister of Ethiopia Aklilu

Habte Wold had later discovered about the feature of the American government in the following terms:

It was difficult to move the American government by appealing to its idealism and sense of justice. Washington's bureaucrats might listen intently to Haile Selassie's request for a whooping hundred million dollar aid package; they might even be sympathetic to the country's aspirations, but, above all, they were Yankee traders who wanted fair returns and they believed that they already had bought Ethiopia (Marcus, 1995:92).

As one can see it from his enlightenment, Aklilu was very much annoyed by the stand point that the American government embarked on. Aklilu's only tactic therefore was to threaten his country's withdrawal from the Western Camp. And he pronounced that, "Ethiopia must ask its self again, just what place does Ethiopia actually hold in the eyes of the US?" Such an exacerbated and frustrated sentiment of the Ethiopian Foreign Minister became a great concern of Washington due to Washington's oversensitivity of the relations between the east and the west. For that matter, the threat of the foreign minister of Ethiopia resulted in a quick decision and forced the US bureaucracies to provide assistance to Ethiopia. Accordingly, by March 1954 the Pentagon had shipped \$3,800,000 worth of small arms, vehicles, and other equipments to Ethiopia (Marcus, 1995:92).

It was really attention grabbing that an official of a small nation making a very tactical move to achieve his country's objective by such a threatening diplomatic maneuver. This condition asserts the idea that claims: it is not only great powers that threaten weak states to incline them towards their own national interest; but likewise weak states also can do it so, albeit that this chance is really available for weak states. If we are on the same line of argument and if we are to share this notion, that was what the Foreign Minister of Ethiopia, Aklilu Habte Wolde really did.

The independence of Somalia in 1960 became a serious challenge to the Ethio-US relationships. The philosophy of Great Somalia provoked a threat upon the territorial integrity of Ethiopia. The concern of Haile Sesilasie to this end was heightened when Somalia started to grab arms from both blocs of the west and the east. Lefebvre presents the offer of armaments that Somalia had received from the Soviet Union and the opportunity that the USSR rushed in for the Horn of Africa at the moment in the following terms:

Moscow achieved an important strategic breakthrough within the moderate African camp in November 1963, when the Republic of Somalia announced that it would accept a \$30 million military aid offer from the Soviet Union, thereby foiling an attempt by the west to preclude Soviet military aid to Somalia (Lefebvre, 1998:617).

This military aid of the Soviet Union to Somalia, while giving a chance to the Soviet Union to hold its feet on the Horn of Africa, the situation very much intimidated the US and its allies. Consequently, the western powers were also obliged to grant a military assistance to Somalia. The statement given by Lefebvre hereunder explains the measures taken by the West to curb the orientation of Somalia towards the Soviet Union and also mentions the antipathy of Emperor Haile Selassie against the provision of arms to Somalia by the West:

During 1962-63 a consortium of western powers led by the United States has presented a series of arms packages of increasing value to Mogadishu. This was done over the long protests of Washington's long time ally in the Horn of Africa, Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selasie (Lefebvre, 1998:612).

Eventually, in order to withhold Somalia's threat, Haile Selassie insisted on obtaining increased military assistance from the US. However, the response of the United States was not as expected by Haile Selassie, and even was none. It would be very imperative to raise a question and to discuss why the US was to take such a position. The question to be asked then is, why did the United States that was considered to be a friend of Ethiopia wanted to provide arms to Somalia and became reluctant in supplying arms to Ethiopia at the time of the arms rivalry between the two belligerent states?

As it has been mentioned in the pages above, the US had had a strong interest in the Horn of Africa in the latter years of the Second World War. In this vein, the two Horn states: Ethiopia and Somalia achieved greater significance in the foreign policy of the United States for the only reason of their strategic positions. For that matter, the United States did not want to lose of sight either of these countries except in some critical conditions like the position of the Derg (1974-1991) in Ethiopia; the US always tried to balance her relations with the two countries. The reason behind was, a close alignment with one of these states and abandoning the other would undoubtedly result in a loss to the other. That may also bring about an alignment of the

abandoned state to the socialist camp. Thus, balancing the relations between the two was a necessity for the US.

As the concern of the Emperor was heightened regarding the provision of arms to Somalia by the US and her western allies, the American officials were supposed to reason out the matter to Haile Selassie. According to the American officials, the provision of arms by the west to Somalia was to deny the opportunity to the Soviet Union to engage with Somalia. The statement here under, exemplifies the way how the Americans argued to convince the Emperor: “The Emperor had to be convinced that it would be far less dangerous to Ethiopia, for the West to arm Somalia, than unfriendly powers to do so” (Lefebvre 1998:623). The core purpose of the argument was that the provision of arms by the US to Somalia was not an advantage to the west alone but it was as well a benefit to Ethiopia. The substance of the argument was that the American officials were trying to tell the emperor that the coming of the Soviet Union to Somalia in the name of arms assistance was a risk to the emperor himself because; the Americans knew that Haile Selassie was fearful of the communists and that he was oversensitive to the stance of communism.

The different attitudes that prevailed among the policy establishment bureaucracies of the US about the Kagnew station sometimes rose up and at others dropped down. Accordingly, the military assistance also scaled up at times and precipitated at others. To this end, in the mid 1960s the rationale for Kagnew was highly augmented and the number of civilians and military officers increased by far. Schraeder’s (1996:129) words briefly explain this condition:

An expanding number of cold war bureaucratic mission associated with kagnew and related facilities in Ethiopia led to a tremendous growth in the official US presence to over 7000 civilian and military personnel including over 3500 at Kagnew by May 1964.

As a result the military assistance of the US to Ethiopia increased from \$8.9 million in 1964 to \$18.2million in 1967, with a similar increase in economic assistance during the same period from \$9.2 million to \$19.0 million. This state of affairs provided a powerful rationale for the incremental enhancement of the US–Ethiopian relationships (Schraeder 1996:130). In a similar manner, Marcus (1995) also asserts the positive attitude of the US officials in increasing the military and economic assistance to Ethiopia and including the rent to Kagnew Station as under:

“Washington accepted the embassy views and also agreed to raise the general level of assistance to Ethiopia, in effect accepting an increase in rent to Kagnaw station and the other American facilities in Eritrea.” Marcus, in his statement above, indicates that the Us Embassy in Addis Ababa had supported the military assistance to Ethiopia and had recommended the provision of arms.

The security relationships of Ethiopia and the US were not only strengthened through financial and weaponry assistance, it was also confirmed by the provision of experts and army officers as well. The army officers were assigned to train the Ethiopian armed forces. Schraeder (1996:130) explains about the mission of the American officers in the following words:

Beginning in 1966, approximately 164 US army officers were assigned to Ethiopia over a period of two to three years, to train the Ethiopian army in the art of counterinsurgency warfare and instill a sense of professionalism within the officer corps.

The other author, Keller also shares the same view about the military training that was offered by the US military officers to the Ethiopian army at different levels. The statement reads as under:

In addition to the military aid, Ethiopia received from the US over the next 23 years, its armed forces also benefited from the presence of Military Assistance Advisory Group, which was established in 1954. The group provided training for Ethiopian force down to the battalion level (Keller, 1987:82).

What we can generally comprehend from the above statement is that the US military involvement in Ethiopia roofed different areas: provision of arms, training of Ethiopian forces, counterinsurgency training to withhold the secessionists in Eritrea and the Somali belligerents in the Ogaden. In this regard, it is safe to say that Ethiopia had benefited from its security relationships that she had established with the US. The US, likewise had also benefited from its security relations with Ethiopia by using the Kagnaw communications base and other facilities in Eritrea.

The significance of Kagnew station that had brought the United States and Ethiopia close together and which had bolstered the Ethio-US security relationships for years however, started to diminish during in the late 1960s. Three major factors contributed to the diminishing aspect of the importance of the Kagnew station. These factors are well stipulated by Schraeder's statements exemplify the conditions that contributed to the low substance of the Kagnew military communications base.

The Vietnam War led to congressionally motivated cuts in the overall foreign aid budget, most notably as concerned Africa, that resulted in ceiling \$12 million in military aid to Ethiopia beginning in 1968. Second, advances in the satellite technology insured that land based telecommunication systems, such as Kagnew and its related stone house project were becoming obsolete as the defense department increasingly looked to outer space. Third, most important, the Pentagon decided in 1966 to construct a military base at Diego Garcia, a lightly populated British possession in the middle of the Indian Ocean (Schraeder, 1996:113).

The combination of these three new developments belittled the worth of Kagnew station and created a precarious policy towards Ethiopia. In line with this, the US military aid was getting lower and lower. Thus, in March 1973, almost all similar operations of the Kagnew Station were taken over by Diego Garcia and the Kagnew Base became obsolete. This situation obliged Haile Selassie to pay a visit to the United States in May 1973. In his visit, the emperor had in mind to obtain approximately \$450 million in military aid. To the contrast, Haile Silasie's request was responded negatively except that he was told that the White House would study the request. Consequently, Pentagon's presence in Ethiopia declined (Schraeder, 1996:136). The other Scholar also writes about the replacement of the Kagnew Station by the new base in the Indian Ocean namely Diego Garcia as under: "Meanwhile satellite technology had made the radio station obsolete, the navy had shifted its focus to the Indian Ocean, and in 1966 Diego Garcia became the US forward base in the region" (Evelyn 2003). According to the view of this scholar, the Kagnew Station significance was further ill-fated by the development of satellite technology.

One may doubt whether the emergence of Diego Garcia and the transfer of US military services to this new base had completely detached the security relations of the two countries. Schraeder, (1996:136) argues to this end by saying: "This turn of events did not signify however, the

abandonment of either Ethiopia or the Emperor.” Although Schraeder is right in telling us about the continuity of the relations of the two countries, by analogy the decline in the services of the Kagnew station undoubtedly would have scaled down the Ethio–US security relationships. The point to be noted here is that, as Aklilu Habte Wold had clearly stated above, the Americans want a substantial return for what they provide for their partners. In this vein, the military assistance of the US would be subject to the level of the relationship and the interest that the Americans would have in the country. Clapham (1988:223) also forwards his assessment on the then relationship of the two states in brief as under: “Even before the revolution, the Ethio-American alliance was already under strain.” According to Clapham, the close relationship of the United States and its military assistance to Ethiopia were at their low ebbs even during the early years of the 1970s.

The 1970s were not good times for the Ethio-US relationships. For the reasons that are indicated above, the military assistance of the US to Ethiopia was getting lower. However, the incessant request of Ethiopia for increased arms assistance continued with high magnitude. To one’s wonder, on the other hand the Americans were also suspicious about the continuity of the emperor’s rule. This hesitant attitude of the Americans had also become a barrier to obtaining military assistance from the US. This was so because, since the end of the 1960’s and the beginning of the 1970’s circumstances in Ethiopia had shown the inevitability of the socio-economic changes in the near future. To this end, the Americans were thinking of their relations with Ethiopia ahead of the regime of Haile Selassie. Clapham’s (1988:223) observation gives the picture of this thought in the following words: “In addition, the Americans had to make provision for their position in Ethiopia after the demise of Haile Selasie, whose regime by the early 1970’s was coming to an end.” Marcus (1995) on the other hand, tells the insight that the Americans had regarding the gradual development of factors of change that prevailed in Ethiopia in the following terms: “When the Ethiopian armed forces deposed the emperor in favor of moderate military government dedicated to political and economic reforms, nearly thirty years of political and military reporting rang true.”

According to this information, the officials of the United States had envisaged a socio-political change in Ethiopia for long. The point here is that, if the American bureaucracies were aware of the eventually emerging change in Ethiopia, why not they advised and lobbied Haile Selasie to

make the necessary arrangement for change in his administration? This point has to be raised here because, the Americans would have been able to influence and even pressure the Emperor to suit his administration to the then rising realities of the country. The logic behind this argument is that this was possible for the Americans because their might and close relationship that they had with the Emperor could have given them access to do so.

If the Americans had taken this position of lobbying the emperor to make the necessary changes in the socio-political conditions of the country, Ethiopia probably might have been saved from the chaos it had been overwhelmed by the regime of the military administration. Furthermore, the country might have also saved all the human capital and the material resources that she lost during the time of the highly resented, unwise and incapable military administration. Be that as it may, unfortunately the military junta snatched the favorable conditions, which the Ethiopian people sacrificed for years. Otherwise, that favorable and ripe condition would have been put in use by the Ethiopian people to establish the long sought and highly aspired-the people's government of Ethiopia." Unfortunately, the Americans had played no significant role in influencing and pressuring the emperor to transform his administration. And Haile Selassie himself was not able and rather was not willing to make it he faced that unpleasant and bitter consequence and was driven out from the palace by his own soldiers in 1974. It was a miserable loss, that he probably might have averted it by democratizing the socio-economic and political system of his administration earlier than the time of the revolution, by the help of his super power ally, the US.

3.4.2. Relations in the Post -1974 Period

As the new military council embarked on state power and favored to adopt the socialist Ideology its relations with the US in due course of time became unpleasant. Gradually, the long standing Ethio -US relations were diminished. Some scholars make Mengistu accountable for the deficiency of this important relationship of the two countries. Getache Metaferia is one and he makes the following brief statement about the loss of the relations and attaches the accountability to Mengistu as follows: "Colonel Mengistu, took an uncompromising stand and remained an obstacle to the Ethio -US relations during the Carter administration" Getachew (2009:63). Some other scholars on the other hand relate the responsibility of affecting the Ethio-US relations to the US and argue that the refusal of the United States to sale arms to Ethiopia

during the time of Ethiopia's hostility with Somalia had pushed the military government away from the West, and thereby forced it to ally with the Soviet Union. The reason forwarded by Taye (2010:15) appears to fit to this judgment:

When USA refused to sell arms to Ethiopia at the crucial time, when Somalia armed to its teeth with modern armaments, invaded Ethiopia to meet its long time grandeur dream of greater Somalia the gloomy hope of repairing Ethio-US relations was broken apart. This was partly and mainly the immediate cause for the shift and radical turn of the revolutionary government towards the east.

According to Taye's statement above, the Derg turned towards the Soviet Union for the reason that Ethiopia was denied to have the arms that she bought from the United States. Still other than these two arguments there is another point of view which claims by saying that there were some radical elements in the council of the military junta right at the outset of the establishment of the military council. According to this view, it was that radical faction within the Derg that latter on brought about the adaptation of the Socialist Ideology as a guiding principle of the political system of the country. Anyways, is it this way or that, Ethiopia was forced to drift in to that dogma, of which the people of Ethiopia benefited nothing but rather suffered the most and lost too much.

The swift turn of the military administration of Ethiopia to the east was something unforeseen by the United States. The Americans, within their attitude of change in the Haile Selassie government believed that in the advent of a change of government in Ethiopia, the US trained military officers would maintain Ethio-US relations. (Schrader 1996) further makes clear the idea of the US officials when he presents it as follows: "Ethiopian armed forces would play an important role in any change in government, serving as the guarantor of US- Ethiopian relations." Unfortunately, however this ideal was gone away when the Mengistu led government of Ethiopia fully turned its face to the Socialist Camp. As a result, when Mengistu's position was found to be hard and fast, the United States turned to Somalia the then belligerent state of Ethiopia for annexing the Ogden region. The rationale given by the Carter Administration for abandoning Ethiopia was said to be the violation of human rights in Ethiopia by the military regime. Getachew (2009:64) does not value the measure taken by the US government and objects it as ineffective in the following vocabulary: "The foreign policy forwarded by the

Carter Administration did not however deter human rights violation in Ethiopia. Rather it led Mengistu to expel US military personnel and to close US agencies.”

The author is right in objecting the abandonment of Ethiopia by the US because; the loosening or rather the breaking away of diplomatic ties creates a gap, or results in the deficiency of negotiations and dialogue between the parties to the dispute. Likewise, that was what happened in reality between the United States and Ethiopia for years. To this end, it is rather advisable and worth nothing to lobby and pressure the contending party while the relationships are ongoing.

The inference of these actions of the Carter Administration and the reaction of the military government of Ethiopia was that the situation further worsened the relations between the two and widened the gap that was already taking place in their relations. This condition eventually forced both parties to take their own measures to show up their preferences which produced negative consequences to both countries. That means the US was forced to find a new partner in the Horn of Africa- Somalia that had cosseted the US too much to fulfill the needs of its new partner. Ethiopia, in a similar manner was also been compelled to look for another superpower and that new ally was the Soviet Union, an ally with a new ideology to accustom with. However, the US which was not pleased with this condition deemed both Ethiopia and the USSR as enemies of the United States and the west. Of course, this was another additional trouble to the already under tense Cold War relationships of the two super powers- the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Since the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Mengistu regime was forced to turn its face to the United States again. To this end, it was said that the Ethiopian government had made an attempt to improve the political conditions that were antagonized to the US principles. Furthermore, the Mengistu government welcomed the immigration of the Ethiopian Jews to the state of Israel. Getachew (2009:72) marks that event as follows: “The supposedly, Mengistu’s political moderation and support for the immigration of Ethiopian Jews to Israel had relaxed the tension to some extent and the relations between Ethiopia and the US improved in 1990.” The United States officials by using this opportunity started to negotiate between Mengistu and the opposition forces. This time however, their effort was not to really resolve the conflict between the two parties but to facilitate the condition for a smooth and

quick transfer of power to the EPRDF. Schraeder (1992:590) highlights the condition as follows: “The need to create an orderly transfer of power in Ethiopia captured the attention of the White House when it became clear that the opposition forces were advancing.”

In the year 1990, where all factors signified the end of the days of the Mengistu regime, his administration was still making all its efforts to resolve the problem by a military means. However, this time the military relationship and the support of military assistance to the Mengistu regime were mainly to come from the State of Israel. Schraeder, (1996:164) observes the situation as follows:”Rather than seeking a negotiated solution to what Cohen in April 1991 described as the ‘most destructive conflict in the world, the Mengistu regime continued to seek a military solution with the support of the Israeli advisors and weaponry.” Consequently, regardless of all its efforts to withhold the forward move of the opposition forces and the resolute determination to stay on power however, the military administration was over thrown from power and was replaced by the EPRDF in May 1991.

3.4.3. Ethio-US Relations Since 1991

The fall of the Derg regime and the ascent of the opposition forces to the state power had made possible the condition to reinstitute relations with the United States. Schraeder describes it as under: “The down fall of the Mengistu regime facilitated the renewal of an historical relationship as well as the promotion of an Eritrean policy that recognized local African realities” (Schraeder 1996:175). The US, that had been critically supporting the Ethiopian territorial integrity in contrast to the objective of the Eritrean guerrilla fighters, then came to acknowledge the secession. Getachew Metaferia also holds the same notion about the fall of the military regime and its resultant outcome regarding the relations between Ethiopia and the United states. In other words, he mentions the normalization of the relations between the two countries in the aftermath of the fall of the Derg. He writes in the following words: “With the overthrow of the military regime in 1991 and at the end of the Cold War, the Ethio- US relationship was again normalized” (Getachew 2009:71). The end of the Cold War and the success of the Eritrean secession group also brought about a change in the US foreign policy towards Eritrea. Evelyn states the changes that underwent in the US policy towards the Eritrean secession as follows:

US policy underwent a transformation from a Cold War opposite to Eritrean secessionist movement, to offering to critical diplomatic and political support to Eritrean leadership. The result constituted the first successful secession in Africa (Evelyn, 2003:47).

The US Center for Defense Information also states the eventual progress and improvement of the relations between the two countries as under:

The transfer of power from the military administration to the EPRDF, in addition to reinstating relations with the US, it also initiated the US to lift its restriction on the assistance to Ethiopia. Diplomatic relations were also upgraded to an ambassadorial level in 1992 (US C.D.I., 2007).

Ethio-US security relationships have been very cordial through the 1990's, and during this time Ethiopia has been provided with substantial military assistance by the United States. The US Center for Defense Information, (US.CDI, 2007) summarizes the assistance in the following manner:

In recent years Ethiopia's support for "war on terror" and the actions it has taken to preserve regional instability-although somewhat controversial in the case of the recent military action in Somalia- have cemented its relations with the United States. Throughout the 1990's the US provided Ethiopia with substantial military assistance. Between Fiscal Year 1990 and Fiscal Year 2001, Ethiopia concluded nearly \$10 million in foreign military sells (FMS), and approximately \$269,000 indirect commercial sells (ICS). During the same period Ethiopia received over \$7 million in Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and more than \$2million in International Military Education Training (IMET).

The US had also supported Ethiopia during the border conflict with Eritrea. In addition to its political support to Ethiopia, the US had provided defense articles during the same period. The Center for Defense Information states that Ethiopia had received over \$11 million in US defense articles, consisting of dozens of cargo trucks and four cargo air crafts. The US had also provided Ethiopia with specific counter terrorism financing and training. Although, Ethio-US relations in the 1990s and 2000s is said to be very cordial, some restraints have also taken place between them. One of the factors for their disagreement was the use of Humvee military vehicles. The statement here under stipulates the reason of their dispute in the following terms (US C.D.I., 2007):

Humvee military vehicles sold to Ethiopia by the US for the counter terrorism operation were used by the government to fire on civilian protestors during the riot followed the May 2005 elections, during which 85 people were killed. As a result, the US government has banned future sell of Humvees to Ethiopia, but other forms of military assistance continue.

The concern of the United States about the misuse of the Humvee vehicles is worth mentioning. However, as far as other weapons are operated upon the bear handed civilians, the ban on the Humvee vehicles seems something that makes no difference but it only becomes the source of ambiguity and debate.

Ehtio-US relationship has made a remarkable difference since the September 11, 2001 accident. The US which has always opposed the act of international terrorism, has virtually reinforced its determination since the accident. To this end, its alliance with Ethiopia is scaled up. The military assistance to Ethiopia since then has grown tremendously and the military security relationship is well bolstered. In this vein, Getachew Metaferia (2009:100) argues as under: “After 9/11, Ethiopia has been categorized as an ally in the fight against terrorism, especially in neighboring Somalia, which has been controlled by lords since 1991, and is referred to as failed state.” According to the statement above, the security relationship between Ethiopia and the United States is further strengthened as a result of the collapsed statehood of Somalia.

This condition may lead us to ask a question about the future of the relationship of the two countries; and the question may revolve around the following idea: would this relationship between Ethiopia and the US, which is grounded on the bad luck of another state, continue with the same tempo or would it, take a different path? This quest may remind us the situation that took place between Ethiopia and the United States during the time of Haile Selassie. That means when the significance of the Kagnaw station appeared to decline in the face of the strategic interest of the US, the United States started to reduce its military assistance to Ethiopia and the general trend of the relationship was shocked. What we can see here is that, in the process of decreasing the military assistance to Ethiopia, the interest and the attitude of Ethiopia regarding the resulting effect was not taken into account. It was only the interest of the United States that was thrown on the weight scale. With this frame of mind, if the crisis in Somalia is resolved successfully and if the threat of international terrorism is put away in the Horn of Africa, it would be likely possible to expect that the security relationship between the two countries may

not continue with the same rhythm; even if the issue might be open for debate. Nonetheless, the military assistance of the US to Ethiopia has ever increased since 9/11.

The following comparative statement made by the US Center for Defense Information on the military assistance of the US to Ethiopia prior and after the September 11, accident indicates the degree of the difference and the profound attention given by the US to the security relationship between Ethiopia and the United States. The statement given by (US C.D.I., 2007) exemplifies the difference as under:

US military assistance to Ethiopia in the five years since September 11, 2001, is nearly two and a half times more than the amount received prior to September 11. US military sales to Ethiopia in the five years since September 11 have roughly doubled, when compared with the previous five years.

In addition to the military assistance that the country obtains from the United States, Ethiopia also participates in East Africa Counterterrorism Initiation (EACTI), launched in 2004 (US C.D.I., 2007).

3.5. Chapter Summary

Ethio-US relationship is one of the oldest and most important ties in the history of the relations that Ethiopia has established. Before the establishment of the formal relationships there were informal contacts between the peoples of the two countries. The informal relations were mainly upheld and dealt by African Americans. African Americans were highly interested in this relationship because; they liked to attach their decent to the country Ethiopia. They were highly fascinated towards Ethiopia for the reason that the name Ethiopia appears in the Holly Bible many times. The informal relationship that existed between the peoples of the two countries had given roots to the formal diplomatic relations that later came in to existence in 1903.

The formal diplomatic ties between Ethiopia and the US commenced on December 27, 1903. The two American individuals namely William Ellis and Robert P. Skinner initiated the idea of establishing relations between the two countries. Finally emperor Menelik and Commissioner Skinner signed the treaty of amity and commerce that gave birth to the formal relationships. Emperor Menelik was very much enthusiastic about the establishment of the Ethio-US relations because; he believed that Ethiopia's friendship with the US could give a guarantee to Ethiopia against the threat that was directed towards it by the European colonial powers. The US was

also in need of the relations with Ethiopia for the Americans were interested in the business that they envisaged to take place in the Horn of Africa in general and in Ethiopia in particular.

The European powers: Italy, France, and the Great Britain were not happy about the development of the Ethio-US relationships. The European powers saw this diplomatic development as a threat to their hegemony in Africa. Accordingly, they prepared and signed a Tripartite Treaty in 1904. The treaty was signed without the knowledge and consent of Ethiopia. The US made no Official statement about the treaty and showed an attitude of indifference.

The US opened its legation in Addis Ababa on December 17, 1906. Frank R. Mower was assigned as the first Council General of the United States in Ethiopia. However, he left his post just three months later. Following the departure of the head of the legation from Addis Ababa, the color of the relations was said to fade because; the desire of the Ethiopian leaders to enhance the relationships was not coupled by the interests of the Americans. The US remained very reluctant in the process of enhancing the relationships until 1941. To this end, the relationships did not result in benefit to both Ethiopia and the US almost for four decades.

The relationships between the two countries began to improve with the defeat of the fascist forces in Ethiopia. When the British forces refused to acknowledge the emperor's sovereign authority and to administer his country, the emperor sought for the support of the Americans. The Americans were also in a better position to assist Haile Silasie this time. The US showed a positive gesture for they were also interested to establish a military communication base in Eritrea. In this vein, the two countries signed an agreement that strengthen their relationships. Thusly, the US possessed the right to use the Kagnew base and other military facilities in Eritrea. Ethiopia was also given the right to obtain the arms assistance and military training by the US. The relationships between the two went on good terms until the second half of the 1960s. Since 1966 the relations between the two countries were not in a good condition. The US congressional cut of budget to the Ethiopian assistance, the development of the satellite technology, and the establishment of a base in the Indian Ocean namely; Diego Garcia reduced the significance of the Kagnew base to the US strategic interests. Consequently, the assistance of the US to Ethiopia was diminished and the relations declined. This situation continued up until the beginning of 1970s. At the time Haile Selassie was threatened by the arms buildup that was taking place in Somalia. In order to balance the threat, Haile Silasie paid a visit to the US

and requested for the US military assistance that amounted to \$450 million. The Americans were not willing to provide the arms and he returned home empty handed. The most important element here is that, the Americans were envisaging a socio political change in the emperor's administration and this had been one of the reasons for their unwillingness to assist the emperor. Just two years later, the emperor was overthrown from power in 1974.

The Military Council that succeeded the emperor adopted a Socialist Ideology and aligned with the Socialist Block. This condition created mistrust between the two countries and forced the US to sanction the arms sale to Ethiopia. The military junta also announced the closure of the Kagnew base and the evacuation of the US military assistance advisory group from Ethiopia. Eventually, the US started to support Somalia and Somalia was encouraged by the support and invaded Ethiopia. The Cuban military forces and the Soviet military advisors supported Ethiopia and the Somali forces were driven out by the coalition forces. As a result the Ethio-US relationships deteriorated and the two countries behaved in animosity to each other until the end of 1980s.

In the year 1990, the Derg was said had improved its political and human rights conditions. This situation gave a chance to the US to play a mediation role between the Ethiopian government and the opposition forces. However, the mediation efforts were not genuine, but to facilitate the condition for a smooth transfer of power from Derg to the EPRDF. Accordingly, the military government was overthrown and the EPRDF took over the state power in 1991. The Ethio-US relations dramatically improved with rise of the EPRDF to political power. Consequently, Ethiopia received substantial financial and military assistance and the diplomatic relationships were raised to ambassadorial level. Furthermore, the relations between the two countries became much closer after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the US and the assistance to Ethiopia was almost doubled. Ethiopia has also been classified as the partner of the US in the fight against international terrorism. At present the two countries are working hand to hand in the war waged against terrorism in the Horn of Africa.

Chapter Four: The Role of Factors of Relations in Ethio-US Security Relationships

4.1. Introduction

Relationships that are formed between states for a number of reasons like: geopolitics, alliance, trade, ideology, etc., change from time to time. Cordial relations change to unfriendly ones. Likewise hostile and antagonistic relations could change to the category of closer and friendly relations. These changes take place due to a number of factors that emerge within and outside of countries. To this end, states are obliged to adjust their relations to the domestic and/or to the external conditions. The adjustments that countries make in response to the changing international and national circumstances result in foreign policy changes and continuities. In this regard, changes and continuities in a foreign policy are inevitable. Changes and continuities that take place in the foreign policy of a state necessarily result in changes and continuities in the relations between countries. Thus, the study and analysis of changes and continuities of relations between countries is very important in understanding those factors of changes and continuities and their impacts on the relations between states. It is on the grounds of these assumptions that this unit of the study is destined to examine the relationships between Ethiopia and the United States because, the US is one of the oldest diplomatic partners of Ethiopia and the former has also a great bearing on the political, economic, security and social conditions of the later.

The first part of the chapter examines the features of the Ethio-US security relations during the Haile Selassie period. In the second part, the purpose of the chapter is aimed at assessing and analyzing the general trends of the factors and their influences on the relations between the two countries in the three regimes. Following the assessment, evaluations and judgments are made to depict whether these factors contributed for the continuity or change in the course of the relations between the two parties. In general, this chapter tries to bring to the fore the factors that determined the course of the relations between the two partners either by making it pleasant or frosty, and thereby enabling or disabling the parties to benefit or to lose from their relations. The chapter is very much related to the preceding chapter because, it analyses those factors of

relations, which the previous chapter has made use of in examining the historical aspect of the relations between the two states.

4.2. The Features of Ethio-US Security Relationships during the Imperial Regime

As it is mentioned in chapter three, the first formal agreement that heralded the commencement of the diplomatic ties between Ethiopia and the United States was signed on December 27, 1903 between Emperor Menelik and Mr. Skinner. Consequently, the treaty passed through different courses of events and finally was confirmed by the opening of the US legation in Addis Ababa in December 1906. Mr. Skinner shouldered the responsibility of managing the issues that were pertinent to the relations between the two countries from Marseilles until the time the US legation was opened in Addis Ababa. Negussay's statement goes in line with the above notion. He said: "Mr. Skinner continued to oversee Ethiopian cases from Marseilles; until the opening of the first resident consul of the US in Ethiopia" (Negussay, 2003:57).

The first Consul General of the US, who had been positioned in Addis Ababa in December 1906, left his post just three months after his engagement to the office. Following his departure the British legation in Addis Ababa took over the responsibility of looking after the American affairs in Ethiopia. The following statement calls attention to the above condition: "General Consul Mower left his post in February barely three months after his arrival in Addis, and the British legation was entrusted with American affairs in Ethiopia" (Negussay, 2003:61). As to Negussay's words above, the basic problem was the low interest that the US developed in the Ethiopian political matters. Since Ethiopia was encountered with many political problems that were directly related to the European colonial powers, the United States seemed to have preferred not to encounter to such problems, for its engagement in the matter may dismay the European powers. Thusly, the US wanted to keep aloof from the political issues and to proceed merely with the non political matters.

Great Britain was one of the European colonial powers, which had great ambition to have control over Ethiopia at the time and it was one of the European countries that were not happy with the development of the bilateral relations between the US and Ethiopia. Getachew (2009:12) clearly states the European resented feeling about the progress of the Ethio-US relations: "When the US made its diplomatic overture to Ethiopia, the European powers resented

it and regarded as a new comer in the international arena especially, in the African politics.” The resentment mentioned above also directly refers to the British. In this regard, it is difficult to admit that the British had accomplished their assignment of representation given to them by the US to deal with US interests in Ethiopia genuinely and without affecting Ethiopia’s interests. Furthermore, this argument can also be related to the Tripartite Treaty, which the three European colonial powers including the British, concluded on Ethiopia against its interest within that same period. Finally, what we can derive from the above argument is that the delegation itself was not a genuine delegation. Even if the Americans were not as such interested to raise the degree of their relations with Ethiopia; in contrast the Ethiopian government had done its level best effort to strengthen Ethiopia’s relationships with the United States. “The endeavor carried out by Ras Teferi to cultivate the relations between the two countries was very crucial in the history of the relations between the US and Ethiopia” (Negussay, 2003:61). The above author, while assessing the attitudes of the two parties towards the improvement of their relations writes in the following words: “The more aggressive Ethiopia was in its endeavor to have close relations, the most tepid and spasmodic became the American response” (Negussay, 2003:75). These conditions of variations of interests of the two countries can lead any one to ask why the Americans were reluctant about their relations with Ethiopia, whereas the Ethiopians appeared much more enthusiastic to strengthen their relations with the US.

The issue can be viewed from the following point of angle, at the beginning of the 20th century although the United States was not a hegemonic power, she was one of the great powers and known for her riches and wealth. In the meantime, the United States was also believed to be an anti colonialist state. Marcus relates the anti-colonialist position of the US to the attitude of Mr. Smith: “Good American anti colonialist that he was, Smith antagonized the sham and hypocrisy of British pose as the higher minded liberator of concurred people”(Marcus 1995:13). Mr. Smith was an American individual delegated by the US to assess the problem between Ethiopia and the Great Britain. What Marcus is telling here is that the British after they assisted the emperor to oust the fascist forces out of the country, they were acting as if they were the mere liberators of Ethiopia from the fascist occupation. However, this ideal of the British clearly undermines the five year protracted struggle of the Ethiopian people. By and large the success achieved over the Italian fascism was not only an accomplishment of the

British military efforts but it was a result of a resolute struggle of the Ethiopian patriots during the entire period of the Italian occupation (1935-1940). The fact is that, thousands of Ethiopians sacrificed their lives and bodies in the anti-colonial and anti fascist struggle. Marcus (1995:9) explains the role of the Ethiopian patriots in the following manner:

To everyone's surprise, the last goal for the British army in ending Italian occupation in Ethiopia was fairly easy to attain, thanks to Ethiopian freedom fighters whose four year struggle had undermined Italian morale.

To this end, the act of the British was unacceptable and was of no ground; albeit that they had given their assistance to Ethiopia in the last episode of the struggle. Moreover, their assistance to Ethiopia was embedded in their interest to revenge Italy for its alliance with the Axis powers and for attacking the Great Britain. The statement below attests why the British not in the late 1930s, but in 1941 showed their willingness to combat the fascist forces in Ethiopia. Marcus (1995:8) writes to this end:

After four years of Italian occupation (1936-1941) Ethiopia's supplication were answered by a suddenly solicitation Albion , which upon Rome's entry into World War II saw an opportunity, to secure the Suez Canal's Red Sea flank from the Axis.

The changes in the global alignment of forces in the early 1940s ignited a change in Ethio-American relations. The ousting of fascist Italy from Ethiopia and the division of the global system in two opposing blocs were the major factors that resulted in changes in the Ethio-US relations. Eventually, the US foreign policy towards Ethiopia was drastically altered. When the British forces became hesitant to hand over the entire territory of his country to be administered under the emperor's sovereign authority, the emperor appealed to the US for assistance to manage the problem. The United States, which had been very cool to all the requests of Ethiopia previously, amazingly sympathized with the emperor's problems this time. To this end, the American delegate was sent to Ethiopia to assess the situation. Harold Marcus states what the American delegate observed about the act of the British forces in Ethiopia after the fascist occupation:

Mr. Smith also pointed out that Ethiopia was surrounded by British controlled territories; that London appointed ministerial advisors that exerted considerable authority under the terms of the 1942 agreement; the indignant Mr. Smith

concluded that, even if the British alone had conquered Ethiopia, I do not believe it follows that they may do with it as they may wish (Marcus, 1995:13).

There is no doubt that the support of the Americans underscored a clear change in their policy towards Ethiopia. And the outcome was an improvement in the relations between the two countries. But the question is, what led to the change of American policy towards Ethiopia in the latter years of the Second World War and then after?

Just to make a reflection on this case one has to consider a number of factors. First, as a result of World War II the global system was divided in two hostile blocs-east and west. Consequently, the Horn of Africa was one of the regions where those blocs particularly the United States and the Soviet Union began to compete for their hegemony and sphere of influence. In addition, Ethiopia was included in the military aid program of the US known as "lend lease in March 1941 by the Roosevelt administration" (Schrader, 1996:115).

Second, within the bounds of these general tendencies of the post war era, the US also developed a vital interest in establishing a radio communication center known as the Kagnaw Station in Eritrea, Ethiopia (Lefebvre, 1998:616). As a matter of chance, those factors combined together helped Haile Selassie to achieve a favorable and positive gesture from the United States. Consequently, these conditions boosted up the US interest in Ethiopia and changed the persistently low scale of US interest to a higher degree and thereby to a change of its foreign policy.

The Kagnaw station was instrumental in maintaining stable and smooth relations between the two countries in the post World War era. Because of the geopolitical significance of the country the Americans provided political support to Ethiopia. They helped in realizing the Ethiopian objective of uniting Eritrea with Ethiopia through a union (Clapham, 1988:221).

At the time when the relationships between the two countries was in a good terms the US officials` acceptance of the British proposal to unify the British and Italy Somali lands resulted in the loss of the color of the relations (Lefebvre,1998:617). On the other hand, this condition created the time and the opportunity for Haile Selassie to show up his skill of interplay over the super powers. Just as an apparent sign of dissatisfaction by the emperor he turned his face to the Soviet Union and paid a visit to Moscow. In the visit he signed a long term credit agreement

(Lefbvre, 1998:617). Just, as it could be imagined was targeted by the emperor, this situation created a high concern upon the US officials. Later on the United States that was not convenient about the Emperor's engagement with the Soviet Union, decided to provide arms assistance to Ethiopia. The American officials also changed their attitude on the issue of the unification of the two Somali lands. They expressed their readiness to support the territorial integrity of Ethiopia. As a result, the smooth relationships which were staggered for a while were restored and were able to continue in their previous cordial environment. Consequently, the Americans also designed a proposal and sent to Haile Selassie. The American proposal included: the increase of US military assistance to Ethiopia by \$ 5 million, the willingness of the US to equip and train the fourth army division of Ethiopia, and Washington's reaffirmation of continued interest in the security of Ethiopia and its opposition to any threat to the territorial integrity of Ethiopia (Lefbvre, 1998:617). As a result the emperor's visit that he paid to Moscow to show his grief earned him more advantage from the United States than what he directly secured from the Soviet Union. That is why the emperor is commended for his policy of playing one major power against the other. It was an apt diplomatic maneuver played by the leader of a dependent and weak state over a super power.

Ethio-American security relationships eventually grew and extended to encompass other segments of the defense force of Ethiopia. Accordingly, the Ethiopian air force and navy were brought under the guardianship of the Americans, which previously were under the care of other countries (Bahiru Zewdie, 2005:186). The extension and the broadening of the American military assistance to these modern military institutions also had a great impact on the relations between the two. Accordingly, this assistance and cooperation had enhanced the relations and had contributed to the continuity of the friendly relations.

The special military training such as the counterinsurgency trainings, which were aimed at enabling the Ethiopian defense forces to contain Eritrean and Somali guerrilla forces (Schraeder, 1996:130), had also added value to the process of strengthening and thereby to the continuity of the warm relationships between the two countries. In sum, there were ups and downs in Ethio-US relations during the time of Haile Selassie. The relationships were halted during the time of the fascist invasion. Except for the conditions indicated above the relationships remained in an environment of friendship and in a state of continuity. Both

Ethiopia and the United States as dependent and strong states respectively had benefitted from their relations during the time of Emperor Haile Selassie.

4.3. General Trends in Ethio-US Security Relationships

This section as mentioned above, analyzes those factors that influenced Ethio-US security relationships in the three successive regimes—the imperial, the Derg and the EPRDF. To this end, the factors that contributed to the changes and continuities in the relations between the two countries are examined and analyzed in relation to the features of the three regimes.

Let us begin with the communication base of Kagnew. This station as it has been mentioned in the pages above, had served as a factor of cohesion for the relations between Ethiopia and the US during the time of the emperor. The base was mutually beneficial to the two countries. Thus, we can say that the Kagnew station served much more to the continuity of the pleasant relationship between the two countries during the emperor's reign. However, with the reduction of the budget of assistance to Ethiopia, with the development of the satellite technology in communications, and due to the establishment of the Diego Garcia base the significance of the Kagnew base to the US strategic interest declined. Consequently, the relations between the two partners also faded. At this time, the base served as a means for a change rather than for continuity. And the change was meant from a friendly mode to a less friendly kind within the emperor's period.

Following the down fall of the regime of Haile Selassie and with the ascent of the military junta to state power, a suspicious environment was created in the relations between the two countries. This condition finally lead to the alignment of the military council to the Socialist world and consequently to the closure of the Kagnew base. This was also followed by the evacuation of all the Americans who were engaged in different fields of activities in Ethiopia. Finally, both the United States and Ethiopia reduced their diplomatic presence to a *charge de affairs* level. This condition clearly indicated the decline of the level of their relationships to a very low rank and was even said that it deteriorated (Getachew, 2009:63). This was a major and radical change in the relations between the two countries ever since its establishment. Finally, this condition directed their relations from a friendly one to a hostile nature. Nonetheless, as a result of the demise of the Derg the relationship between the two countries was revitalized. Thusly, a major change was experienced in the relationships between the two countries. Accordingly a radical

change took place in the relations. The change that has come to the scene was a friendly one, which avoided the long established hostile relations between the two countries at the time of the Derg.

The emergence and the gradual strength of the Eritrean secessionist group had pressured the two countries to work together and to strengthen ties between them. Haile Selassie's government was offered substantial political assistance and other forms of support from the US to suppress the anti-government forces in Eritrea. This was done with the assumption that Eritrea's independence was feared by the US to result in Eritrea's exposition to the Arab influence and to the Soviet aggression (Schraeder, 1996:117). This attitude of the US created a favorable condition for Haile Selassie and extended the way for arms assistance to his government. Consequently, this environment facilitated the condition to strengthen the cordial relations between Ethiopia and the United states and thereby for the continuity of the smooth relations between the two.

However, with the fall of the Emperor's reign and with the rise of the military junta to the state power, Ethio-US relations suffered a loss. This was so because, the actions that were undertaken by the Derg such as the closure of the Kagnew base, the evacuation of the Military Advisory Assistance Group (MAAG) from Ethiopia caused to stop the support that was flowing to Ethiopia aimed at against the will of the Eritrean secession group. Gradually, the relations between the two dropped down. This condition finally changed the nature of the relations of the two countries to the unfriendly mode (Taye Berhanu, 2010:15). Finally, as a result of the decline of the relations between the two parties, the resistance of the Eritrean succession group lacked its potential to attract US assistance to Ethiopia. Thusly, the Eritrean guerrilla fighters could not serve as a means for the continuity of the security relations between Ethiopia and the United States at the time of the Derg.

With the overthrow of the military regime and the coming up of the EPRDF to a state power in 1991, however, the relationships between Ethiopia and the US on the subject of Eritrea took a different shape. The United States that uncompromisingly supported the territorial integrity of Ethiopia for a long period of time swiftly changed its position and provided political and diplomatic support to the Eritrean leadership (Evelyn, 2003:47). This position of the US brought the two countries- Ethiopia and the US- to a similar footing because; the new leadership that

controlled the political system in Ethiopia also staunchly supported the separation of Eritrea from Ethiopia. In line with this, the Eritrean leadership was able to maintain the freedom first through a military force and eventually the sovereignty of the territory by a seemingly negotiated agreement. Evelyn describes the condition as follows: “After thirty years of war with the Ethiopian government Eritreans finally negotiated and voted their way to independence in 1991-93.” Since the United States and Ethiopia were working hand in hand to the achievement of the recognition of the Eritrean sovereignty from the onset of the fall of the military government of Ethiopia, this condition has helped to strengthen the relations between them and accordingly has contributed to the continuity of their friendly ties.

After the rise of the two new states in Eritrea and Ethiopia, the US was said to be a friend of both countries. When the two states were engaged in the border conflict in the Bademe area in 1998-99, the United States by collaborating with other countries had made its efforts to resolve the problem through a negotiated peace. The first peace plan of the US and Rwanda however, did not antagonize Ethiopia’s interests and it was in line with the Ethiopia’s needs concerning the contested areas by the two conflicting parties. Thusly, the Ethiopian government accepted the plan. On the contrary the Eritrean leadership rejected the peace proposal. Tekeste Negash and Kejetil Tronovol (2000:65) explain the condition:

Despite, the escalation of the conflict the mediation efforts were underway. The United States and Rwanda had used their good offices for facilitation. The mediation finally came up with a four point peace plan. As the peace plan was consistent with Ethiopia’s demand, Ethiopia accepted it on June 4, 1998. On the other hand, the Eritrean authorities refused to accept the proposal.

As mentioned above, this was another moment in which the two countries-Ethiopia and the US-experienced good and smooth relationships and this has contributed to the continuity of their cordial relations.

The Republic of Somalia as mentioned earlier had been a major threat to the security and territorial integrity of Ethiopia during the time of Haile Selassie. The desire of Somalia of annexing the Ogden region from Ethiopia was not resolved during the time of the emperor. As mentioned earlier Somalia hence became a nuisance for the territorial integrity of Ethiopia for

the third time during the Derg regime (1977-78). Schrader's (1996:144) statements make clear the above notion:

July 17, just after two days after Carter approved providing Mogadishu with military aid, the Somali army invaded the Ogaden region of Ethiopia with a force of roughly 250 tanks 12 mechanized brigades, and 30 fighter aircrafts.

At this time Somalia was highly armed by the Soviet Union. The military government of Ethiopia was also making its level best effort to balance the threat that was highly in favor of the Somali military capacity. Accordingly, the Derg sought to purchase arms from the United States. However, the United States that was highly dismayed by the ideological affiliation of the military council with the socialist world disallowed the sale of arms to Ethiopia. The arms were already paid for (Getachew, 2009:64). This condition widened the gap in the relationship between the two. In addition to the sanction, the United States revenged the Derg by siding with Somalia. On the other hand, the military government of Ethiopia strengthened its ties with the Soviet Union and began to amass arms from the east. In the mean time, Ethiopia terminated the Ethio-US security agreement. Schrader (1996:141) briefs this situation: "Several days later, Mengistu unilaterally terminated the US-Ethiopian Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement." Consequently, the two poor nations of the Horn of Africa-Ethiopia and Somalia were engaged in a very costly war, a combat that consumed their human capital and the meager resources of these underprivileged nations. The point here is that, the cordial relations between Ethiopia and the US dropped to its low ground. The friendly relations changed to an antagonistic type. To this end, the case of Somalia became a serious source of divergence in the relations between Ethiopia and the US. This condition turned the relations to animosity during the Derg regime.

Following this event, the two governments of Ethiopia and Somalia had made their level best efforts to destabilize each others' regimes. They did it so by providing support to the belligerents of their counterparts. As a matter of chance for Mengistu, the opposition forces that fought the Siad Bare government were successful in overthrowing the government of Somalia. Then after, Somalia became a territory without a state.

At present, Somalia has been a collapsed state and has begun to be administered by different war lords and at times by a transitional government. This condition has made Somalia a safe haven for international terrorism. The international terrorists, who have laid their bases in

Somalia, are hostile to both Ethiopia and the US. This instance has brought the two countries together and has forced them to ally against those forces of terrorism. This condition has also been a factor to strengthen their security relationships. Since then, Ethiopia has been identified as a partner in the fight against terrorism. As a result Ethiopia has been offered with military and financial assistance from the US. In addition the Ethiopian forces have been provided with counterterrorism trainings (US C.D.I., 2007). Consequently, the above conditions have contributed positively to the continuity of the gracious relations between the two states.

Since September 11, 2001, the security relationships between Ethiopia and the US have been strengthened by far. This event has brought the two states to work hand in hand than ever before; and in a more collaborative manner. The final analysis is that the troubled political condition in Somalia and the 9/11 event, which resulted in the motto known as “fight against terrorism,” have cemented the relationships between Ethiopia and the United States (Getachew, 2009:100). In this regard, the Ethiopian-American relationships have been very strong. Most importantly, this condition has contributed to the continuity of the cordial relations between the two.

The most attention grabbing remark here is that the unrest and the crises in Somalia have been the foundation for the strong security ties between the US and Ethiopia nowadays. This distressed and troubled condition of the neighboring Somalia has served as a factor for strengthening the relationships between Ethiopia and the US. Ethio- US relations that suffered from the hostility between Ethiopia and the US because of the state of Somalia since the late 1970s, is now benefiting from Somalia’s disintegration and collapse.

The Government of the EPRDF that replaced the Marxist state of Ethiopia since 1991 has been taking part in the Peace keeping process in the African conflicts. The Ethiopian forces have participated in the peace keeping task in Ruanda, Burundi, Liberia and the Sudan. The following statement given by Schraeder (1996:143) explains the role that the EPRDF government has played in the peace keeping activities under the umbrella of AU and the UN:

In recent years, Ethiopia's support for the war on terror and the actions it has taken to preserve regional stability- although somewhat controversial in the case of the recent military action in Somali-have cemented its relations with the United States.

In this regard, the role of the Ethiopian government that it is playing in the peace keeping practice has contributed to the continuity of their friendly relations between the US and Ethiopia.

The geo-political position of Ethiopia that it is endowed in the Horn Region had been one of the major factors that attracted the US towards Ethiopia. This position of Ethiopia had been well utilized by the US in promoting its interests. The United States had used this position of the country as a means to curtailing the communist expansion to the east and central Africa. The US had also used this vicinity as an instrument for controlling the sea routes in the Middle East and the Indian Ocean. This region was also used by the US for her close watch over the Persian Gulf and the oil fields in that locale (Makinda, 1982:100,101; Schrader, 1996:113; Taye, 2010:3). These advantages that the region provided to the US strategic interests were freely and unilaterally utilized by the Americans during the time of Haile selassie. In this regard, the priorities that the region provided to the west in general and to the US in particular had been a factor of close relationships for the Ethio-US contacts and had also contributed much to the continuity of the smooth relations between the two at that same period.

With the coming of the Soviet Union to the Horn region and its hold of feet in Somalia in 1963, the situation did not continue as favorable as it was for the Americans. Especially, when the Soviet Union departed Ethiopia from the US and when the USSR became the major arms supplier to Ethiopia. Lefebvre highlights the win of the bid of monopolizing Ethiopia's relations by the Soviet Union at the expense of the United States as follows:

The Ethio-US relations that lasted during the time of Menelik, Haile Selassie, and for a short while with the military administration, was completely over taken by the Soviet since 1975. And this was a major change in the relations between Ethiopia and the United States (Lefebvre, 1998:2).

In this process, the United States lost its old partner of the region, Ethiopia; and allied with Somalia. Consequent to this event, the relations between Ethiopia and the United States came

under the environment of suspicion and distrust. Eventually, as a result of the above unfavorable conditions the cordial relationships between the two changed to animosity.

Following the independence of Eritrea in 1991, Ethiopia definitely lost its natural coastlines and was detached from its sea routes. Accordingly, its long lasting ports of Matsawa and Assab were deserted from its possession. To this end, Ethiopia actually became one of the countries of the world that are known to be without ports and land locked. Accordingly, Ethiopia became dependent on other ports for its marine transportation: Djibouti, Mombasa, Barbara, etc. Such a political development in the region other than deterring Ethiopia from its possession of out lets to the sea has also diminished its strategic position in the Horn of Africa, which the country enjoyed since the time immemorial.

However, the above supposition has not been proven true especially, with the collapse of the state of Somalia. The fragmentation of the Republic of Somalia made the country vulnerable to terrorism. It is widely believed that Somalia serves as a terrorist hideout. The emergence of terrorists in that part of the Horn of Africa consequently resulted in the collaboration of Ethiopia and the US to deter the spread of terrorism in the region. Thus, the strategic importance that was lost due to Ethiopia's loss of its coastlines did not actually devoid its strategic significance to the US. Getachew Metaferia (2009:49) argues in accordance with the above line of reasoning when he says: "Ethiopia is currently landlocked. Nevertheless, landlocked Ethiopia still has a geopolitical significance to the United State."

This event of the unforeseen condition, which emerged in the Horn, became an essential element to strengthen the security ties between Ethiopia and the United States. At this particular moment in time, the US and Ethiopia are closely working on this major problem of the globe. In the mean time, Ethiopia is also making advantage from this opportunity and is obtaining a substantial assistance from the United States (US C.D.I., 2007). Thusly, the continuity of the friendly relations between the two is upheld by this unforeseen incidence. However, the relationships which are set up on such a condition are liable for both the state of change and continuity.

The international system, which always is at a state of flux and which is very difficult to grasp its trends precisely, has also been among the factors that affected the Ethiopian-American

security relationships at times. The pre World War II era, as it has been mentioned earlier had exerted pressure on the Ethio-US relations. As this period was highly dominated by the European colonial powers and as Ethiopia was also under the keen watch of those predators, the relationships between Ethiopia and the US were very insignificant and were shaded by the influence of the European colonial powers. A good instance of this argument could be the signing of the Tripartite Treaty by those powers in 1904, without the notification of the case to the country directly concerned to the matter, Ethiopia. The important element here is that the general situation that persisted during that period had forced the relations between the two countries to keep on a very low tempo. And this had also abated Ethiopia's benefits that it was supposed to obtain from its relations with the United States.

As it has been shown in the pages above, the US was not courageous enough to stand by the side of Ethiopia in Ethiopia's struggle against the European domination and suppression until the end of the Second World War. This condition of the US could be related to its friendship with those powers of Europe like the Great Britain, France and others (Negussay 2003:95). Thus, the international political system that existed at that time did not allow the growth of the bilateral relations between the two countries and the relations continued with their low level for decades.

On the other hand, the defeat of Italy in Ethiopia and the end of the Second World War had signified a major change in the relationships between Ethiopia and the United States. Particularly, the advent of the division of the International system in two hostile blocs and the dominance of the Cold War phenomena at the global level was a moment of opportunity for the growth of the relationships between the two countries. To this end, Ethiopian- American security relationships had benefited from the opportunity that the Cold War had created. This in turn, had contributed to the reinstatement and gradual development and continuity of the cordial relations between the United States and Ethiopia` from the launch of the 1940s up until the ascent of the military junta to the state power in 1974. The endeavor carried out by the Emperor in this regard was of a vital worth for the reestablishment of the relations between the two countries after the II World War. Negussay (2003:170) marks the condition:

The situation was ideal for Haile selassie whose ambition for Ethiopia's continued independence was exceeded only by his diplomatic skills. He enjoyed and finally wheedled Washington into reopening its legation in Addis Ababa.

At the pick of the Cold War era and when the Bipolar International System allowed the Soviet Union to challenge the west and when the Soviet Union was able to compete for the Socialist hegemony, the Horn of Africa came under a tight confrontation between the two super powers. Ethiopia was one of the countries nominated as a candidate for that contest of the east and the west. For the reasons that are mentioned in the pages above, the Soviet Union won the rivalry and took away Ethiopia from the west since the mid 1970s (Lefebvre 1998:2). Thus, the surfacing of the bipolar system, the coming out of the Cold War phenomena, and the eventual competitiveness of the Soviet Union departed Ethiopia from the United States and frozen the relationships between the US and Ethiopia. The point here is that the factor that was brought about by the Cold War events forced the relations between the two countries to fall apart. The following statement is pertinent to this argument: "The Ethiopian-American relations had moved however, according to the world's political temperature during and after the cold war" (Getachew, 2010:14).

Some other factors of the international system have also played a very crucial role in the Ethio-US relations since the late 1980s. These conditions are- the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Ethiopia that banked on its entire hope on the Soviet Union for the supply of arms and for its security matters faced a crucial dilemma with the emergence of the above state of affairs in the global system. Consequently, the Soviet Union was not willing and/or was unable to continue with her previous assistance to Ethiopia. For the reason of that, the relationships between Ethiopia and the Soviet Union were shattered. Consequently, there was no other alternative for Ethiopia than turning its face towards the United States.

The Soviet leaders that kept on alienating Ethiopia from the west previously, were kind enough this time to advise the Ethiopian government to make a deal with the United States. Likewise, the military government of Ethiopia requested the US to upgrade their shrunken relations. Nonetheless, the US by referring to Ethiopia's human rights record responded negatively to the call of the Derg (Getachew, 2009:70, 72).

When one assesses the US rejoinder from the point of view of the contemporaneously existed situations, the US seemed to correctly envision that the days of the Mengistu reign were getting short. To this end, it was more likely to say that the US was facilitating the condition to reinstitute its relations with the newly upcoming force to the political power after the Derg regime, which was presumed to be the EPRDF. Hence, the response of the US towards the request of the Derg to upgrade the Ethio-US relations was influenced by the imbalance of power that existed between the Ethiopian government and the opposition forces. And this was so because; the guerrilla fighters were threatening to advance to Addis Ababa at the time.

In this regard, one could argue that, had the balance of power between the two conflicting parties been in favor of the military government, the reply of the US to that request of the Derg might have been different than what we observed above. The point here is that, in addition to the major external factors the internal condition of the country had also played role in shaping the mode of the relations between the two countries. If the response of the US towards the call of Ethiopia had been positive and if the relations between the two were moderated in accordance with the Ethiopian will, the course of the history of the country might have been dissimilar to what actually came about to happen in the country. However, as a matter of chance or curse that was not the case. The US refused to upgrade their relations and the course of the history of the nation followed the presently existing pattern.

Then again, what we have observed above was not the final event that occurred in Ethiopia as a result of the end of the cold war era. In fact, the above statements have shown us that the end of the cold war phenomena had implied the continuity of the unfriendly relations between the US and the military government of Ethiopia. On the other hand however, the end of the Cold War had marked a major change in the relations between Ethiopia and the United States. The US that refuted to promote its relations with the military government engaged itself in the process of negotiating the two conflicting parties-the Derg and the Guerrilla fighters. Taye Berhanu states the approach the US made use of, to exploit the condition that was brought to the surface as a result of the end of the Cold War as follows:

The supremacy of the US in the international arena since the collapse of the socialist system and its role in mediating the Ethiopian government and the

fighting opposition forces have opened the door for rapprochement and for revival of historical relations with Ethiopia (Taye, 2010:15).

As it had been clearly declared by the American officials and as has been mentioned in the pages above, the purpose of the negotiation was not to bring about a negotiated harmony between the two conflicting parties. The negotiation was aimed at facilitating the condition for a smooth transfer of power. That transfer of power had its own pointer in the relations between the two countries. That means the US that turned down the quest of advancing relations with the military government of Ethiopia however, acknowledged the improvement of its relations with the newly formed government. Thus, it was apparently visible that why the US was not interested to positively respond to the call of the Derg.

Be that as it may, the point here is that the end of the Cold War Season finally resulted in a change of relations between the two countries from a hostile mode to a friendly fashion. This sociable relationship between the two countries is on progress and is continuing on a forward move at the present moment. The final analysis is that the international system which is expected to change from time to time has apparently played a vital role in influencing the relationships between the United States and Ethiopia. The system has sometimes facilitated the condition for the continuity of the same style of relations and at the other forcing the relations to change its mode.

The dilemma here is that, will the international system continue to do likewise in the period yet to come, or call off its impact? Well, that is what we could not be able to have a say at this particular juncture in time but, it is something which the Ethio-US relations may encounter or may not, depending on the type and extent of changes that may occur in the global system sooner or later.

4.4. Chapter Summary

Relationships between and among states are subject to changes and continuities. This happens because of a variety of reasons: ideological, military, commercial, social, etc. Friendly relations change to unfriendly ones and fractured types change to gracious relations. Changes and continuities in the national interests and foreign policies also result alteration in the relations between and among states.

Ethio-US relations were established in 1903. The relationships persistently continued in a very low tempo almost for four decades. During this time, the desire of the Ethiopian leaders was very high to strengthen the relations. On the other hand the Americans showed a less interest in doing so. This had greatly affected the benefits that the two countries could have earned during those days. The main reason for the American reluctance was the need to disengage themselves from the political issues Ethiopia was confronted by at the time. This was very much related to the problems that the European colonial powers were imposing upon Ethiopia.

The American position changed from its low interest to an active type since the early 1940s. When the fascist forces faced their defeat in Ethiopia, Haile Selassie was travelled by the British forces, he sought the US assistance and his request was responded positively. In the mean time the Americans also developed interest to establish a military base in Eritrea, Ethiopia. The coincidence of the interests of the two countries gave a boost to the enhancement of the relations between the two countries. Accordingly the two countries signed agreements that allowed the US to have unhampered access over the Kagnaw base and Ethiopia also was provided the right to military assistance and trainings by the US. Consequently, the relationships that remained in a very low level for almost forty years became very friendly. The smooth relations that started in the early 1940s, continued until the second half of the 1960s.

Since the second half of the 1960s the relationships began to fade. The budget cut for the Ethiopian assistance, the development in satellite technology, and establishment of the station to the US strategic interests. Following the situation the relationships between the two countries dropped to the ground. This condition continued up to the beginning of the 1970s. However, when Somalia started to amass arms to achieve the idea of greater Somalia, Haile Selassie was annoyed by the act and paid a visit to the US with the aim of obtaining \$450 million in military. Unfortunately, the Americans were not willing to provide the assistance and the emperor returned home with none. This condition affected the relations negatively. Eventually, the Emperor was deposed from power in 1974. The US did make no official statement concerning the deposition of the emperor.

The emergence and the gradual strength of the Eritrean secession group had enhanced the friendly relations between the two countries. As Ethiopia was antagonized to the Eritrean separation group for the reason of territorial integrity of the country the US was also opposed to this group. The reason for the US contrasting position towards the secessionist group was the fear that independent Eritrea would be influenced by the Arab pressure. Likewise the US was threatened that independent Eritrea would fall a prey to the Soviet aggression. The situations stated above brought the two countries to uphold a similar position towards the secessionist group and resulted in strong support to Ethiopia from the US. This similar state of affairs eventually facilitated the condition to the strengthening of the relations and thereby to the continuity of the friendly relations. The Eritrean cause did not served as a factor of relations that attracted the US support to Ethiopia with the coming of the Derg to state power. The Republic of Somalia worked as factor of relations that resulted in changes in the relations between the two countries during the time of Haile Selassie. Somalia as well became a factor of relations that seriously affected the Ethio-US relations at the time of the Derg. With the fall of the Siad Bare regime and as a result of the disintegration of Somalia, Somalia became a factor of relations to strengthen the relations between the US and Ethiopia. As Somalia turned into a collapsed state, the territory befitted as a hide out to international terrorism. The terrorist group developed as an enemy to both Ethiopia and the US. This condition aligned the two countries to fight this common enemy and they started to work hand in hand. Consequently, the US offered substantial assistance to Ethiopia and their relations was heightened. Thusly, the friendly relations between the two countries are characterized by continuity.

The geo-political position of the country had been one of the factors of relations that enhanced the continuity of the friendly relations at the time of Haile Selassie. At the time of the Derg, the geo-political position of Ethiopia brought another super power to the region of the Horn of Africa namely the Soviet Union. This condition had negatively affected the friendly relations between Ethiopia and the United States. Although, the geo- political position is greatly reduced due to the lose Ethiopia encountered on its out lets to the sea, the disintegration of Somalia has still made Ethiopia important to the US strategic interests and has helped to the boost of friendly the relations between the two countries.

The international system has been one the important factors that affected the Ethio-US relations. The pre II World War era had played a negative role against the relations between the two countries. This period forced the relations between the two countries to remain at its low ebbs as a result of influence that the European colonial powers exerted on the US. The post World War period had enhanced the relations between the two countries and had contributed to the continuity of the smooth relations. On the other hand, the later period of the Cold War phenomena had affected the relations negatively because; the ideological shift of the Ethiopian government changed the relations to animosity. The end of the Cold War era and the disintegration of the Soviet Union had again facilitated the condition to reinstitute the warm relations again. This condition, gave a chance to the United States to regain its lost position at the time of the Derg. To this end the relations between the two countries has been strengthened.

Chapter five: Conclusion

International relations imply interactions between and among states through which they pursue their national interests. International relations mean much more to weak states for they are more deficient in addressing their demands than the wealthy states. Thus, when dependent states establish relations with stronger states, they aspire to benefit more than in their relations with the states that have similar status with that of theirs. Ethio-US relations have found their roots in such a belief. When Menelik II signed the 1903 treaty with the United States, the emperor had in mind much more ambition to obtain a substantial assistance for the security and development of his country.

Ethio-US relationship came into being a century ago and had celebrated its centennial inaugural ceremony just a decade back. The first four decades of the relations between the two countries one can say were insignificant from the point of view of their contributions to the interests of both countries in general and to that of Ethiopia in particular. To this end, Menelik's aspirations had not rung true at least for that particular period in time. The diplomatic ties between the two started to slightly serve the interests of the two countries since the end of World War II. The US interests that emerged to develop in the later years of the war were the basis for that active intercourse. Eventually, the Cold War rationales of the US had facilitated conditions for further advances and interactions that existed between the two nations. During the pick days of the Cold War both Ethiopia and the US had made their benefits out of the Ethio-US relations. The relations between the two parties underwent well through the 1950s and up until the mid of the 1960s.

Their diplomatic contacts deteriorated as a result of the fall of the Haile Selassie regime in 1974 and the swift turn of the Military Council towards the Socialist Ideology. During this period both the United States and Ethiopia developed pessimistic attitudes towards one another. Consequently, the situation extended to the extent of hostility and animosity. As result Ethiopia lost all the benefits that she was to obtain from the US. The US interest areas in Ethiopia were also banned by the Derg. It was the worst case scenario in the history of the diplomatic relations between the two countries.

The overthrow of the military administration and its replacement by the EPRDF in 1991 heralded the revival of the relations. The United States lifted all the sanctions that were imposed on Ethiopia. The diplomatic relationship was also raised to ambassadorial level. Consequently, Ethiopia began to obtain substantial financial and military assistance from the US. The September 9, 2001, accident and the disintegration of the state of Somalia, boosted the relationship. Today, Ethiopia and the United States are working hand in hand to tackle the problem of international terrorism particularly, in neighboring Somali under the motto known to as “fight against terrorism.”

Ethio-US relations have been experiencing some ups and downs in its long lasting course of existence. Internal and external conditions have played determinant roles in this regard. The factors include: the geopolitical position of the country, the Kagnaw military base, the emergence and maturity of the secessionist groups in Eritrea, the ambition of Somalia to annex the Ogaden region, the attitude of the Ethiopian and the US officials, the international political environment like: the colonial scramble for Africa, the emergence, the pick, and the end of the Cold War phenomena, the disintegration of the Socialist Bloc, the political turmoil in Somalia, changes of governments in Ethiopia have contributed to the now and then changes that took place in the relations between the two countries. These elements have pressured the relations to undergo through friendly and unfriendly circumstances at times. The factors mentioned above have sometimes forced the relations to change from one style say from cordial to a hostile type. At others, they have altered from a blurred mode to a bright fashion. Accordingly, the factors have rendered changes and continuities in the relations between the two countries. The continuity of the smooth mode of relations has enabled the two countries to enjoy benefits. On the other hand, the changes from a gracious to awkward types have denied them benefits and even have tempted them to behave in animosity.

Ethiopia, that has been identified as a friend of the US for long still ranks among the poorest nations of the world. The point to be noted here is that the aspiration of Menelik II that presumed the US as a vital and dependable benefactor in the course of the country's development had not been attested true even a century latter.

The above state of affair may provoke one to raise a question why Ethiopia that aspired to enhance its development being backed by the US assistance has not achieved its aspiration so far and remains as poor and underdeveloped as she was at the verge of the 19th century.

This vital concern of the nation could be reflected from different perspectives. The first consideration could be the dependent nature of Ethiopia. Ethiopia's domestic and foreign policies as policies of a dependent state are influenced and pressured by external forces-friendly and unfriendly ones. Such policies cannot focus on the existing problems and realities of the country. And if the policy of a country is not devised on the grounds of the realism of the country, that policy cannot address the actual problems. If the actual problems are not tackled, all the endeavors carried out to promote the progress of the country if any remain unproductive.

The other mirror image to the issue refers to the foreign policy of the US. The foreign policy of the United States towards the Horn countries considers these countries as a means for solving non-African problems. In this regard, the relationship between the US and Horn countries had not been meant to resolving the actual problems of these countries. To this end, Ethiopia is not the exception. Thus, the foreign policy of the US has not assisted the country to address its problems. If the foreign policy of the US towards Ethiopia continues on this same line, the relationships between Ethiopia and the US can provide no remedy to the real problems of the country and cannot help the country to embark on a development avenue. In this vein, the United States of America should focus on the reconsideration of its foreign policy towards Ethiopia-as her old and reliable ally in the Horn of Africa till today. This is so essential, if the progress of Ethiopia is the concern of the US.

Still to pass on to some other factors, the hostile nature and behavior of the neighboring countries towards Ethiopia had also been a factor that compelled the country to focus more on her security matters than the development agenda. In other words, the development issues had not been a priority to Ethiopia's policies. Due to the psychosomatic and actual treats that existed upon the Ethiopian policy makers for ages, much more attention was given to the security matters than other issues. Rather, one can say, the development questions were left to lie down. The point here is, at least initiating and encouraging the nation for development endeavor, and trying to allocate at least a bit of that scanty and meager resource of the country would have been made by the successive regimes of the country. Had that been the case, there is no doubt

that the country might have made a little progress. This argument can be related to the Chinese proverb that says: “A journey of thousands of kilometers begins by the first footfall.” However, the above mentioned internal and external conditions have deprived the country from aiming at and actualizing the goal of the development of the country,

Ethiopia and the US began to exercise their business activities even before the commencement of the formal relationships. Their strong commercial links have gone well even during the pre-occupation period and when the diplomatic exercise was near to the ground. From this point of view, the US would have ranked as one of the leading trade and investment partners of Ethiopia this time. However, countries that started their trade transactions and investment practices with Ethiopia recently have surpassed that of the US by far. The People’s Republic of China is a good example in this regard.

Such a slow moving trade and investment behavior that persistently existed between Ethiopia and the US-the country with a leading economy of the world, would greatly affect the benefits that Ethiopia might obtain from the business transaction and investment deal that the two countries could make. To this end, the problems and hindrances that have curtailed the progress of their business transactions must be examined and assessed in order to resolve the problems and to make the most out of their economic relations.

The two countries just as they are working hand in hand to tackle the threat of international terrorism, they should also work in a very close manner to get to the bottom of the problems that have denied the growth of economic ties between them. Ethiopia must endeavor to the level of her best to attract the US business persons and investors. The art of economic diplomacy, which is being claimed by the Ethiopian government at present, must play a magnificent role in ameliorating the business deal and addressing the yawning gap in the area. The United States should not also abandon Ethiopia in this area and should not give the opportunity to those countries that are business rivals of the United States. In other words, the presently existing reluctant business behavior may facilitate the condition for those countries that may strive to make the US out of the game of the Ethiopian business and investment arena. Business persons and investors of the US must give due attention to the opportunities that Ethiopia could endow to them. As William Ellis had exclaimed a century ago, the US must assist Ethiopia in its development endeavor by taking part in the business and investment enterprises. The progress

and development of Ethiopia is meant to trim down the burden of the emergency aid and other forms of assistances that the US is supposed to offer to Ethiopia.

Human rights, democracy, and good governance issues have often been the point of controversy in due course of the relations between Ethiopia and the US. The disagreements that result in from these issues, have affected the friendly relations between the two countries at times. There are times that resulted in the sanctions of the US upon Ethiopia because of the bad status of human rights and democracy in Ethiopia, according to the reports released by the State Department of the US. In this regard, the two countries should pay attention to the differences that arise from the issues mentioned above and seek solutions to their differences. These issues must not be used for political motives by either of the countries. Both the US and Ethiopia must use open diplomatic procedures and discuss how the gaps could be narrowed. The two governments must be open-minded to find solutions to the cases that arise now and then regarding such important matters. Merely releasing reports and issuing reactions can only serve the interests of the media but do not really help to bring down the disputes and disagreements and do not bring about the required results that can benefit the Ethiopian people. Such actions only further aggravate the gaps. Negotiating and discussing over the issues is by far advisable and can better help to address the deficiencies and to result in better outcomes.

The promotion of the foreign relations of a given country undoubtedly depends on the type of the foreign policy the country devises, the extent of its application, and the diplomatic prudence of the country. And the formulation and the exercise of a sound foreign policy can be affected by the domestic conditions. To this end, a state should pay attention to its internal conditions as well in order to make the most out of its foreign contacts.

The issue of national consensus is one among the many that seeks the focus of a state and the people. When, the political groups and other clusters of a given society advance common and mutual understandings on the major political questions of a nation that leads to stability and progress of a nation. This in turn, facilitates the condition for the formulation of a right foreign policy. And a sound foreign policy lays the ground for the foreign relations of that country to be accepted and respected by the foreign counter parts. This condition as well minimizes the chance of foreign forces to interfere in the internal affairs of the country. In this regard, national

consensus plays a determinant and crucial role in the promotion of the international relations of a nation and thereby to the enhancement of the national interests of a state.

The Third World countries are often blamed for politically marginalizing the different sections of their societies. As it has been observed at times, governments in Africa are accused for monopolizing the state power through family, clan, ethnic group, and other forms of affiliations. The consequence of monopolizing the political power by certain kinds of connections has been very injurious for the security, stability and development of countries. The present political developments in the northern African countries have proved true to the above argument. This implies the necessity for a fair, equitable, and uncompromising distribution of the political power of the state and also the national resources of a nation. This condition has got a direct relationship with the international relations' of a country because; a fair and equitable distribution of political power of a nation results in peace, stability, and mutuality in the country. The prevalence of peace and stability in a country gives chance to the formulation of a reliable foreign policy and thereby to its application through respected and valued international relations. As a matter of fact, the issue of a fair and equitable share of political power should not be undermined if a state is to pursue appreciated and cherished international relations.

An equitable, a just, and a rational share of national resources in a given state enhances the role of its international relations. In this highly interconnected world the political exercises accomplished in different countries are apparently visible to other states of the world. The impartial distribution of national resources is an issue that is very much linked with the question of human rights, democracy, and good governance. Accordingly, in the present world states are supposed to comply with these principles. If a state fails to meet these vital demands of its people and the international community at large, citizens develop resentment upon their government, and instability may reign in that state. Furthermore, the state's prestige, respect, and legitimacy fall in to question at the international level. This in turn diminishes its acceptance in the international arena. The failure that the country hosts in this regard as well affects the country's international relations. In view of this, a transparent and unambiguous distribution of national resources is of a vital significance in the process of promoting the international relations of a state. Thusly, it is to the most advisable for states to uphold the idea of a fair and equitable distribution of national resources

At last, all the good ideas, principles, norms, and aspirations that we have come through this study are not inaccessible and unreachable for human beings. They are quite affordable. Their realization merely requires the good will and determined efforts of mankind. Particularly, their achievement rests on those who have the access and the upper hand at the national and global levels-the political leaders of the world. Nonetheless, those personalities have to be the ones that could challenge and keep away from their own egoistic and narrow nationalistic interests. For egoism and narrow nationalism have wretched the destiny of human beings to the greatest extent at different epochs in the history of humanity.

We have to appreciate and to scale up the good experiences that states have traversed through for centuries. And we must be courageous enough to condemn and to dispose of the evil deeds of their past. In line with this state of mind, we should aspire for a better of tomorrow. Forgiveness, compromise, open-mindedness, and mutuality are the bases in this regard. So let us all be optimists that with a better and mutual understanding between and among nations, and with a resolute will power of the political leaders of the world, and with the proper application of the positive trends of international relations to the interactions of states: peace, democracy, cooperation, and progress will triumph in our planet.

To wind up the discussions that we have come through so far, there is no doubt that it is very difficult to precisely grasp the present situations and as well to accurately predict the future of the international political environment. Nonetheless, based on the existing realities the thesis would like to forward the following proposition as a final concluding remark on the Ethio- US security relations.

Those conditions that threatened Ethiopia to give more emphasis on her security matters for long and that diverted her focus from her development visions like: the Colonial Era and the Cold War phenomena are the events that have gone off course. The present world also seems not to host such circumstances again. The hostile attitude of the neighboring countries is also on the verge to reduce if not put away once and for all. Ethiopia's vulnerability to threats and violence of aggressions are also on their last legs, when viewed from the current trend of the pathway the country has embarked on.

To this end, based on the above general tendencies the country is found in and the international political environment is experiencing, it is right to be heard that Ethio- US relations unlike its previous position that mainly focused on security issues, should center more on a long lasting and strategic business partnership of the two countries-Ethiopia and the US. For this could undoubtedly improve the bilateral economic interest of the two nations and thereby could boost up the capacity of the security of Ethiopia.

Bibliography

- Amare Tekle (1989), "The Determinants of the Foreign Policy of Revolutionary Ethiopia", in *the Journal of Modern African Studies*. Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 479-502.
- Bahiru Zewdie (2005), *History of Modern Ethiopia 1855-1991*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Clapham, Christopher (1988), *Transformation and Continuity in Revolutionary Ethiopia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evelyn, Fracas (2003), *Fractured States and US foreign policy: Iraq, Ethiopia and Bosnia in 1990,s*. New York, Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Getchaw Metaferia (2009), *Ethiopia and the United States: History, Diplomacy, and Analysis*. The United States of America, New York: Agora Publishing.
- Gove, Babcock P. & the Marriam Editorial Staff (1971), *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*. Springfield, Masticates: G. & C. Marriam Co.
- Hornby, A.S. (2000), *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of the Current English, 6th ed.* Oxford: Oxford University.
- Hutchful, Eboe (2000), "Understanding the African Security Crisis", in Musah J. K. Faxemi (EDs.), *Mercenaries: An African Security Dilemma*, pp. 210-232. London: Pluto Press.
- Keller, Edmond J. (1987), "The Politics of state survival: continuity and change in Ethiopian Foreign policy", *Annals of the American Academy of political and Social Sciences, International Affairs in Africa, Vol.489*, pp. 76-87. Saga publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, (Accessed: 25\01\2010).
- Lefebvre, Jeffrey A. (1998), "The United States, Ethiopia and the 1960 Somali Arms Deal: containment and the Balance of Power Dilemma in the Horn of Africa", in *The Journal of Modern African studies*, Vol. 36, No.4, pp. 611-643. United Kingdom: Cambridge University press.

- Makinda, Samuel M. (1982), *Conflict and the Super Powers in the Horn of Africa, third World Quarterly, Vol.4, No.1*, pp. 93-103. Taylor & Francis Ltd. Available at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3991509>, (Accessed: 24/12/2009).
- Malhotra, Kumar V. (2001), *International Relations*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications Pvt. Ltd.
- Marcus, Harold (1995), *the Politics of Empire: Ethiopia, Great Britain and the United States*. Lawns, New Jersey: Red Sea Press.
- Ministry of Information Press & Audiovisual Department (2002), *The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia: Foreign Affairs and National Security: Policy and Strategy, pp.1-156*. Addis Ababa.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. & Revised by Thompson, Kenneth W. (2003), *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, 6th Ed*. New Delhi: Kalia Publishers.
- Moon Bruce E. (1983), "The Foreign Policy of a Dependent State", International Studies Association, Quarterly, Vol. 27, pp. 315-340. USA: North western University.
- Negussay Ayele (1977), "The foreign Policy of Ethiopia", in Aluko Olajide (ed.), *The Foreign Policy of African States*, pp. 46-71. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Negusay Ayele (2003), *Ethiopia and the United States: The Season of Courtship. Vol.1*. United States of America: Copy Com.
- Norman, Palmer & Howard Perkins (2004), *International Relations: The World Community*. India: A.I.T.B.S. Publishers.
- Seven, Rubenson (1978), *The Survival of Ethiopian Independence*. London, Ibadan, Nairobi: in association with Esselte Stadium and Addis Ababa University Press.
- Schrader, Peter J. (1992), "The Horn of Africa: US Foreign Policy in an Altered Cold War Environment", in the *Middle East Journal, Vol. 4*. pp. 571-593 Middle East Institute, Available at, <http://www.jstor.org>, (Accessed: 25/12/2009).
- Schrader Peter J. (1996), *US Foreign Policy towards Africa: Incrementalism, Crisis and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Srivastava, L.N., (2003), *International Relations, 13th Ed.* Delhi: Super Printers.

Taye Berehanu (2010), *An Introduction to Ethiopia's Foreign Policy: Pre 1991.* Addis Ababa: Far East Treading.

Tekeste Negash & Tronovoll Kjetil (2000), *Brothers at War: Making Sense of Eritrean Ethiopian War.* Oxford: James Kerry.

U.S. Center for Defense Information (2007), *Ethiopian-US Relations: Country reference for Ethiopia.* Available at, <http://www.cdi.org/pdfs/>, (accessed: 21/12/10).

U.S. Embassy (n .a.), 100 Years of Ethio-U.S Relations Publications Commemorative of the Centennial Events, Ethiopia: Addis Ababa (unpublished).

Declaration

I, the 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 material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Feleke Debela Zewdie

April, 2011

This thesis is submitted for examination with my approval as an advisor of the candidate.

Dr. Asnake kefale

April, 2011