

# Ethiopia: Drums and Rhythms of the International Value Warfare

Habtamu Alebachew

*For all their strengths, NGOs are special interests. The best of them ... often suffer from tunnel vision, judging every public act by how it affects their particular interest. Since NGOs do have to worry about policy trade-offs, the overall impact of their cause might bring more harm to society.* Jessica Mathews<sup>1</sup>

‘Value warfare’ is a type of violent conflict involving usually polarized ideological antagonisms or contradicting worldviews between two opposing parties, states or individuals, etc. In the present age of increased international relations, ‘value warfare’ takes place with a deliberate and established use of words that have intentions to cause changes in favor of one party in the war against the other. Ethiopia has stood in face of such mounting international value warfare particularly from a long list of Non-Government Organizations, alternatively also called Civil Societies. Three major ‘bones of contention’ have emerged particularly since 2009 to dominate the heated battle between Ethiopians and the Ethiopian government versus these international civil societies. These are: environment, individual liberties and community rights.

The vast engagement of Ethiopia in the construction of unusually huge hydropower dams is at the center of the battle over environment, community rights and protection. Recently, the expansions of foreign investment in Gambela Region and other areas also incite Civil Society offensives. Next, Anti-terrorist and Civil Society Regulation Proclamations come to supply the thug-of-war on individual liberties and democracy, in general.<sup>2</sup>

This paper intends to investigate into the logic and nature of this value warfare on both sides of the counter-Ethiopians versus NGOs. Before this, nonetheless, it might be of help to review briefly, what international NGO meant to the most adult minds of Ethiopians.

## 1. Looking into the Past--the Era of ‘Ethio-Pessimism’<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jessica T. Mathews (Jan. - Feb., 1997). Power Shift. Foreign Affairs "Power Shift" Retrieved 2012-06-01. Subcontracting Peace - The Challenges of NGO Peace building. Edited by: Richmond, Oliver P., and Carey, Henry F. Published by Ashgate, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> See the ICG August 2012 Report: Ethiopia after Meles. The Report makes citations of almost all International NGOs, International Financial Institutions, Journalists and states including China depicted as starkly opposing most development policies, practices and trajectories of the Ethiopian government, particularly, the late Prime Minister Meles Zenawi.

<sup>3</sup> See Dawit Woldegiorgis’s Red Tears written in 1986 exposing the entire events and activities of the Derg Government and international NGOs during the 1985 famine and Ethiopia’s broken image in the international relations of the time. Dawit also accuses Derg’s government if its policy, institutional and technical inefficiency as a responsible factor for the unrestricted interventions of International NGOs and outside governments particularly from the West. He also gave examples of global media reports emphasizing that Ethiopia is a case of state hopelessness, which I summed up as

It is methodologically imperative to ask when and how Ethiopia came into the acquaintances of international NGOs as volatile partners. Despite, their presence in Ethiopia since the 1960s, Civil Societies-NGOs grew to be a willy-nilly structural part of Ethiopia's socio-economic affair during the 1985 national famine.

It is trite but true that Ethiopia during and after this point of time was an agenda of failure story labeled at the table of the West--its policy makers, government leaders, scholars, civil societies, even, artists and the media. The British Broadcasting Corporation--BBC once reported the British parliament in 1985 complained that aid provision for Ethiopia meant not an emergency issue but a normal state of affairs. . The BBC reporter commented that Ethiopian leaders were more worried about how to acquire more arms than how to feed their starved populations. The *Economist* on its part mocked at what it called the 'misguided' Ethiopian aid mentality of the time writing: *when they beg for aid, Ethiopians look like a creditor who furiously asks for the repayment of his overdue loan.* The meaning is clear: Ethiopians understand food aid not as a charity but as their basic right to have it.

As a result, a wide feeling of hopelessness, incapacity, a weakened and emaciated self-image and understanding, in short, complete pessimism prevailed over the Ethiopian sky. The pessimism invaded the Ethiopian thinking of the time across urban centers that many citizens began to mock and jock on their own. The Ethio-pessimism deepened to the extents of complete self-disrespect, aggrieving the Victory of Adwa over aborting chances of Italian colonization and worshipping whatever western. The pessimism craved into other less affected rural parts of Ethiopia, too, where many farmers helplessly asked whether there was rain in Canada, their only last hope to get wheat. The message is this: I know my situation is hopeless to survive as a human being; I could do so only if Canada produces wheat and sends it to me.<sup>4</sup>

At this most difficult time, many White Charity leaders and their experts had recognitions among the victims. Some became much more popular and famous than Ethiopian government officials were for their humanitarianism. With no exaggeration, this was Ethiopia, about which the world grew to be hopeless and pessimistic. At this time, one should admit that Ethiopia needed these International NGOs more than they needed Ethiopia. This was the picture of structural famine and deplorable life circumstances in Ethiopia at the time when the present regime came into office.

Since then, a lot has changed—a dramatic shift from the era of the broken spirit of Ethio-pessimism to that of the true shining of Ethio-optimism. In the words of many outside independent observers, *Ethiopia is fast on the rise.* Now, let us see the logic, ideological-political drums and rhythms of the NGO-coordinated value warfare waged against

---

<sup>4</sup>Ethio-pessimism.

<sup>4</sup> This was said because many victims of the 1985 famine very well knew that Canada was the largest donor of wheat and the socks bore Canadian name and national flag in bold red.

present Ethiopia against these backgrounds.<sup>5</sup>

## **2. Ethiopia: Bird's Eye-View of the Value Warfare**

The value warfare over Dams and their impacts both on environment and community rights dates back from 2008 with the fierce criticism on Ethiopia by, for example, a Civil Society called 'International Rivers' repeating same concerns in 2012. This organization challenges Ethiopia with a communiqué titled, "What Cost Ethiopia's Dam Boom". According to IRs, Gibe III, a large dam under construction in the Omo Valley will have negative consequences of displacing inhabitants, and there are major concerns for its effect on the Omo River and valley, with repercussions up to Lake Turkana in Kenya.

Another traditional critic against the adverse effects of Ethiopia's current development policy is the Human Rights Watch. HRW in its 17 January communiqué denounces the Ethiopian government for advancing a growth policy that goes against Human Rights expectations giving it a title that runs saying: "Waiting Here for Death: Forced Displacement and 'Villagization' in Ethiopia's Gambella Region". Another western-based Civil Society called the International Crisis Group-ICG agrees with the above criticism but goes further in slashing the government of Ethiopia for its wrong growth policy. In its Review Paper issued in August 2012, the ICG argues in rejection of the Ethiopian government's report on five issues.

First, it says all the said growth at an average rate of 11% is an exaggeration. Second, the growth reported so far has never been robust as desired by its architect, the late Prime Minister Meles Zeanwi, and even donors. Third, the Ethiopian government provided for foreign investment over four million fertile hectares of land at low prices. The transfer of the lands has caused forceful eviction of indigenous inhabitants in specifically Gambella Region. Fourth, the construction of dams has no any domestic development goal but a political project for insuring geo-political influence in the region. Fifth, the Five-Year Growth and Transformation Plan is an ambitious statement and a wishful thinking that could never achieve its goals.<sup>6</sup>

The ICG adds that Ethiopia's growth is only a promise of failure in the near future. It justifies its position with a set of arguments. It poses that the Ethiopian government claims that its socio-economic policies have produced sustainable internal development. However, ICG stresses, many critics call it state-driven capitalism or authoritarian

---

<sup>5</sup> A popular Magazine *African Business*, in its January 2011 edition uses a title reading: Ethiopia, a return to the Lion's place; the *Economist* in its 2011 volume also uses 'Ethiopia Rising' as a subtitle in its focus on developments in Africa. Ibrahim Jelil an expert in International Relations of the Middle East in his article, 2012, on China's role in the development of Ethiopia particularly on the Renaissance Dam and Egyptian response used the a title reading: Ethiopia on the rise, Egypt in decline. The *Economist* reported that Ethiopia stands at the rank of the 10<sup>th</sup> largest exporter of livestock in the world after it reminds that this country was once a symbol of famine and direct food aid.

<sup>6</sup> See the ICG August 2012 Report: Ethiopia after Meles. The Report makes citations of almost all International NGOs, International Financial Institutions, Journalists and states including China depicted as starkly opposing most development policies, practices and trajectories of the Ethiopian government, particularly, the late Prime Minister Meles Zenawi. According to ICG a Chinese official warned the Ethiopian government of the dangers of 'mere economic growth' by citing the prevalence of environmental population as the negative externality of China's fastest growth. ICG however did not state how this Chinese official said this in direct negation of the widely known Chinese Policy of non-intervention in the national politics of states. The ICG cited all the listed NGOs as a reference to support the international scope of civil society reservation and opposition on the Ethiopian government.

development, whose major beneficiaries are the political elite and their entourage, not the wider polity. ICG argues, while Ethiopia's development trajectories have superficial similarities to those in China, they face greater challenges and are unlikely to work well in the end. For ICG, China's development is much better than that of Ethiopia, because, in the former, the Communist party is the guiding motor, while in Ethiopia PM Meles Zenawi sat at the driving seat.

The ICG author cites another Civil Society, apparently so from its name, *OpenDemocracy*, 31 December 2011, for supporting its positions. According to *OpenDemocracy* land transfer in Gambella and other Regions has been nothing but, in its words, 'the great Ethiopian land-grab: feudalism, Leninism, Neo-capitalism' both agree on one caricature of growth in Ethiopia, which they call 'development by force'. In tune with this, ICG confirms its support for an argument by an individual journalist and commentator, Richard Dowden, who writes, "How Meles Rules Ethiopia" and "Africa: Development or Democracy, Which Comes First?" Dowden and ICG's answer says apparently, Democracy comes first.<sup>7</sup>

Even though I could not know where its headquarter rests, another Civil Society known as *African Resources Working Group* shares in its comments in January 2009 the same position with the ICG and IRs' arguments<sup>8</sup>. It says that the Hydro-dam project in the Lower Omo River Basin of Southwest Ethiopia would cause massive displacements probably far beyond the government's capacity to handle and redress the dangerous consequences. According to International Rivers, in another recent report, argues that the dam boom in Ethiopia including the Grand Renaissance Dam<sup>9</sup> could lead to more violations of community rights and could cause regional deadly conflicts, which make all dams there a matter of the entire African concern. ICG warns that Ethiopia would risk conflict with Egypt by its Renaissance Dam, which did not have the purpose of improving socio-economic lives of Ethiopians.

Back to the Human Rights Watch, it grew more impatient in its arguments in 2010 titled, 'Ethiopia: Development without Freedom' that the western donors are also responsible for the human rights violation in Ethiopia in their provision of aid. The Human Rights Watch and the ICG paint the overall growth path and practice in Ethiopia as, "Ethiopia: Donor Aid Supports Repression,"<sup>10</sup> "Aid Management and Utilization in Ethiopia – A study in response to allegations of distortion in donor supported development programmes" and so on. ICG cites comment by Development Assistance Group (DAG) Ethiopia, July 2010 in a paper titled, "Social protection: safety nets for the vulnerable". ICG like Human Rights Watch shares another report that says, "Minister for Africa raises

---

<sup>7</sup> See the ICG August 2012 Report: Ethiopia after Meles

<sup>8</sup> See the ICG August 2012 Report: Ethiopia after Meles

<sup>9</sup> See the ICG August 2012 Report: Ethiopia after Meles

<sup>10</sup> The Executive Director of the Human Rights Watch, Denis Roth, also wrote an article on post-Meles Ethiopia titled: Death of an autocrat: Opportunities for Democracy in August 2012. In this article, the director accused PM Meles Zenawi of committing violations of human rights even though he could not deny Meles's success in socio-economic development. He also accused that the Meles government used development and food aid for political purposes in a discriminatory manner between his supporters and opponents. I replied to the director that his article was far in excesses of the duty of an international NGO as it was a naked intervention in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state.

concerns over harsh sentencing under Ethiopia Anti-Terrorism laws”. They also cite UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, 18 July 2012 in a report that says, “EU HR Ashton followed closely recent trials under the Ethiopian Anti-Terrorism Proclamation” EU, 13 July 2012;

Amnesty International probably surpasses almost all the above NGOs in the size and frequency of critical reports on Ethiopia and the government behavior since early 1991. AI shares almost all concerns by ICG, HRW, IRs, and many others like the France-based Doctors without Borders, the Transparency International, Freedom House, and others. Some of these organizations have admitted that there were good beginnings in democratization in Ethiopia since 1991 but marked by an abrupt reversal since 2005 post-election crisis. Others, on the other hand, accept that there is remarkable economic development since 2005 but without democracy and freedom. Some are again more concerned with localized targets like human rights violations in Somali, Oromia and Gambela regions, while others emphasize violations of religious freedoms.<sup>11</sup>

One way or another, however, almost all international civil societies agree on the prognosis that Ethiopia is far behind global democratic, human rights, environmental, etc, expectations and standards. The point here is not whether this report and generalized picture of the Ethiopian state is true or not. The point is what meanings the politics, legitimacy, morality, technical appropriateness and relevance of NGO warfare on Ethiopia and the existing regime bear to past and present Ethiopia.

### **3. Principles that Matter**

As implied below at ensuing parts, I, as an Ethiopian ordinary citizen, strongly believe that one should not view all criticisms by NGOs as lethal weapons of an enemy attack. However, NGOs critics, on their part, have to be sure about the objectivity, plausibility, rationality and logical soundness of their criticisms. One can fairly expect almost all the NGOs mentioned above have to meet these expectations for some four justifications:

Firstly, these NGOs are within the scholarly category of Civil Society created not for undertaking social services and development interventions in Ethiopia and other developing states. By their constitutions, they have no the duty to travel across distant rivers without bridges and remote desert zones of Ethiopia to work fulltime with and among marginalized communities. They have no a single social service project like material, technical and psychological support for disadvantage communities—the urban poor, rural children, women or the disabled. They have been creations with the goal of only *campaigning* for the promotion of what they call ‘best global values’—human rights, democracy, environment, etc--so that these values could get chances to flourish everywhere.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> See again the same article by the Executive Director of the Human Rights Watch, Denis Roth, 2012, U.S.A.

<sup>12</sup> See the ‘Ethical Codes’ of the NGOs developed and agreed by a list of international societies under the coordination of Amnesty International in 2006. This joint forum shows that international NGOs have differing, if not fragmented, interests, intervention areas, working principles and strategies.

Secondly, these NGOs are not local or national in their scope. They are international in their coverage having the legal, procedural and morale licenses to operate in every country in the world they deem important. As a matter of full time job as compared to government leaders engaged with a multitude of responsibilities every day, they act in disfavor or favor of states and their governments, which are, in many cases, most organized, well budgeted, pre-planned and, at least, in principle, responsible to their own populations. In addition to their own high-profile professionals, these states, if not governments, have the chances to employ best-minded international consultants and think-thanks for soliciting most refined critical suggestions for their policies and practices. For this reason, these NGOs ought to have necessarily best qualified, wise, insightful, critical and rationally balanced professionals to squarely match and face the former when labeling their criticisms.<sup>13</sup>

---

**According to the cited scholars here, International NGOs, by their very nature:**

- Have no any practical development projects in Ethiopia/Africa in the assistance of target states and communities like water, environment, employment, etc,
- Have no any agreed framework or contracts agreed with the Ethiopian government on the specific intervention area they advocate; it is their own choice;
- Have no any agreed or clearly stated scholarly approach or paradigm that could guide and direct their thinking and activities in the present world;
- Have no any broadly debated and globally publicized codes of ethics, governing values, working principles, or constitutions that control their behaviors;
- Have no any common and globally coordinated program, forum, communication mechanism, or measurements of failure or success of their activities;
- Have no any clearly announced statements of autonomy from the direct or indirect influences and interventions of their individual or corporate donors/sponsors;
- Have no any responsibility or accountability to what they report, say, write or inform about the behaviors of the Ethiopian government; no one asks them;
- Have no any internationally agreed auditing standards or machismos of budget control or plan of action how to utilize their donated money;
- Have no any other job or private income source or investments other than donations by individuals and corporate firms;
- Have no any clear policy and plan of human resources where they employ usually imprisoned and convicted opposition party leaders as experts and directors;
- Have no any set of binding strategic plan that points out where and where they have to intervene—they are always guided by crisis situations,
- Have no any known and agreed ‘country specific’ checklists determining positive progresses or negative reversals; America and Somalia are the same for them, etc.

---

Thirdly, these NGOs, by their very nature, and, in principle, are not establishments for the attainment of any special political goal in Ethiopia or profit making. In the civic sense

---

<sup>13</sup> Baur, Dorothea, and Hans Peter Schimitz. 2012. Corporations and NGOs: When Accountability Leads to Co-optaion. *Journal of Buiness Ethics*. 106.

of the argument, they are not registered and legally potent citizens to be that much concerned. From institutional points of view, these NGOs are not, for example, states, governments, political parties, criminal bands like *mafia*, armies, etc. They are, as their names vividly testify, Civil Societies or organizations with no affiliations to governments and their ideological-political views. Thus, the minimum expectations of states about the NGOs are that they would have the skill intrinsically how to become impartial, empirical, and readably educative in ironing out targets of their criticisms.<sup>14</sup>

Fourthly, as the result of all the above, international NGOs have the freedom, privileges and opportunities, more than citizens, political parties, interest groups, etc, in Ethiopia, for example, to curve up their own constitutional and ethical rules wholly by themselves, plan, collect and allocate their budgets as they find it appropriate, and the communication outlets without restrictions by diplomatic protocols. These NGOs could file and pose their observations of government behaviors in a manner that also incites critical interests on the part of other major powers, multilateral organizations, the United Nations and other influential international institutions. At the same time, NGOs, no matter how big they are, they are never authoritative agencies like governments. Thus, their powers of influence must always come from their efficiency and integrity for the cause of truth<sup>15</sup>

This guarantees these NGOs with the venue to exercise and apply the best potentials they have in making their criticisms sensibly admissible and powerful enough to exert moral influences. This again demands a careful and knowledgeable use of excellent professions and professionals. How are the NGOs, however, doing this assignment?

#### **4. Ethiopia: Travelling Half the Road**

Of course, after I tried to compile most criticisms by International Civil Societies, I still felt that I did only an iota of the task. In the process of sorting out the data, I had to fight against my bias by avoiding the temptation to allow one question by one former lecturer of mine in the 1990s to guide my mentalities: *whose country is Ethiopia?* I do not believe that this is a naïve question; it comes out of a deep understanding of how the post-1991 western-originated civil society views Ethiopia and Ethiopians, and vice versa. It may also incite a serious question in the minds of average Ethiopians what legitimate grounds and rationales these NGOs have to try to instruct and discipline Ethiopia, a legend of historical sovereignty, how to behave itself and act in its international relations. We have to forget all these questions shortly, however.

With all clearest divergences in socialization, culture, self-understandings and value representations between these NGOs and Ethiopians set aside again, I do not have the opinion that all their concerns about Ethiopia are always pointless and void.

Firstly, these civil societies certainly sound reasonable in that hydropower plants can

---

<sup>14</sup> See the ‘Ethical Codes’ of the NGOs developed and agreed by a list of international societies under the coordination of Amnesty International in 2006.

<sup>15</sup> Baur, Dorothea, and Hans Peter Schmitz. 2012. Corporations and NGOs: When Accountability Leads to Co-optation. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 106.

cause some kind, level, and extent of desirable or undesirable effect on the environment and the social setting, in general terms.<sup>16</sup> Environmentally, hydropower projects may cause changes in the natural course of rivers somehow that would, in turn, affect biodiversity, whether conditions, habitats of fauna and flora, balance among the various forces of nature and so on. Socially, they affect the settlement patterns of communities, economic activities, occupations and sound ecologies. Environmentalists include many other possible changes, hazards or improvements, which accompany vast use of manmade construction inputs like cement, steel and other chemical-born materials. Environmental geographers go beyond these to include the negative effect of changes in river courses on the natural rotation of the earth around the sun.

In detailed examinations, the overall effects of these hydropower projects may have four aspects and levels: presently negative impact, future hazard, presently zero-impact or presently and futurity improvements. There are other differences as far as extents effects are concerned that emanate from the differences in the levels of socio-economic growth and socio-economic structures among states-developed versus developing societies. Obviously, Ethiopia lacks most technical, technological and capital resources in the process of building unmistakably accurate and environmentally the state-of-the-art hydropower plants. One could reasonably assume that such unavoidable irregularities may adversely affect individuals or surrounding communities, one way or another.

Secondly, in the areas of procedural democracy or whatever, too, similar capacity limitations may also cause these or those wrongs. Practically speaking, this or that public official at the prosecutor's office or the police could misuse this or that authority of him in the cover of the law against individual and community rights causing unparalleled morale injury. Moreover, let us positively say that these NGOs might really be working for the best of things in Ethiopia. Again, government responses to their demands aside, let us assume that their influences may make themselves felt across differing Ethiopians with diverging interests but the government remained unresponsive even, as they said, repressive.

While I am disillusioned with the possibility of all such failures, however, humbleness and conscience compel me to raise questions more important than the questions above, *is this, looking back at the above extract, what these NGO are doing vis-à-vis Ethiopian or another?* The question is again: *whose belongings are these international civil societies?* Are they sure that they are helping the Ethiopian people, the government and the country or causing a massive indignation in their masterly languages, in general, through these much bitter and hostile criticisms? From the depth in the enmity of their rebuffs whatever Ethiopian, could one conclude that these NGOs would have declared war if they had not been, at least, in principle, civilian?

---

<sup>16</sup> Worldwatch Institute (January 2012). "Use and Capacity of Global Hydropower Increases"; Renewables 2011 Global Status Report, page 25, Hydropower. published 2011.

In general, my critical demand for help from these International Civil Societies is to convince me that the Ethiopian government is, by consciously worked out and deliberately designed policy, is against the rights and liberties of its own citizens and communities to the extents of inviting foreign bodies to grow concerned. If the answer is that the NGOs should enjoy influence and trust as people with no stake behind them, then, I must step into the following discussion and challenge them further. If so, why are they as described and explained in ensuing parts?

#### **4. The Grand Paradox at the Backgrounds**

Almost all Civic Society staffs from board officials to experts are originations of the developed north culturally, ideologically, socially, politically and economically<sup>17</sup>. However, their target states including Ethiopia are in all aspects of societal life a different socio-economic and cultural structure fundamentally distinct from the home countries of these NGOs. Thus, these Northerners and we, Ethiopians, have undergone completely differing socializations and trainings from our childhood up to now. As the result, leaving aside their morale rights to represent a different socio-economic structure alien to them, one epistemological question is important. Are these civil societies sure enough that they know Ethiopia more than we Ethiopians know our country and populations?

The grand paradox is that these civil societies grown out of the opposite individualistic socio-economic structure have posed themselves as the protectors of these communities more than Ethiopians when the issue is hydropower project. When the concern is politics and federalism, the individualistic obsessions of these NGOs blind their eyes that they forget the rights of these communities. They rather stand with their intermediaries, value compradors of the west, in Ethiopian jacket in Addis Ababa-civil societies, individuals, the private press, and opposition parties. They adjust their tones in denouncing the federal order as divisive, artificially asymmetrical and, in the long run, dangerous to the survival of the Ethiopian state. The paradox becomes bitterer when these westerners dare accusing Ethiopians of poor understanding of the meanings of community right and minority protection.

When asked why they paradoxically think and act so, these NGOs usually reply that this is the age of 'globalization' and 'universalization' of global humanistic values and norms. The message is clear: we stand for globally accepted norms of the highest moral ground where humanity stands at the center so that socio-economic differences mean nothing. Is it true and plausible? Let see other paradoxes.

The other structural paradox is epistemological and scholarly<sup>18</sup>. These Civil Societies

---

<sup>17</sup> Pawel Zaleski Global Non-governmental Administrative System: Geosociology of the Third Sector, [in:] Gawin, Dariusz & Glinski, Piotr [ed.]: "Civil Society in the Making", IFiS Publishers, Warszawa 2006

<sup>18</sup> Issa G. Shivji is one of Africa's leading experts on law and development issues as an author and academic. His critique on NGOs is found in two essays: "Silences in NGO discourse: The role and future of NGOs in Africa" and "Reflections on NGOs in Tanzania: What we are, what we are not and what we ought to be". Shivji argues that despite the good intentions of NGO leaders and activists, he is critical of the "objective effects of actions, regardless of their intentions".[Shivji argues also that the sudden rise of NGOs are part of a neoliberal paradigm rather than pure altruistic

claim having held rationally sound and scientific as well as empirically proven modern approaches that guide their activities but in fact having had none of them at all. Modern scholarship in the west has never so far come up consensually, at the minimum, with a working theory or approach in any of academic disciplines to explain the fundamental rule governing interstate and international relations in the era of what they call 'globalization'. For some scholars, the present age perfectly represents rather a complete mental anarchy in which knowledge lags behind events. As the result, many researches increasingly call on the concept and notion called 'globalization' for renewed critical redefinition and reconceptualization.

On the one hand, such utopian approaches like '*Idealism*' has resurfaced themselves back to the discussion table because of the remarkable progress in the evolution of the European Union. This promise soon evaporates however by the strong reassertion of the opposite approach, '*Realism*', because of the nationalistic rise of China, Conservative India and mercantilist Japan. Other approaches have come up including '*neorealism*', explaining the era of globalization as the age of international anarchy within interdependence, but faltered to stand and grow as a conclusive view.<sup>19</sup>

Other approaches like '*neo-idealism (new liberalism)*', increasing international cooperation and value universalization, and, '*globalism*', explaining globalization as the declining significance of political boundaries and mental fences, '*cosmopolitanism*', as a stateless thesis of globalization, appear and reappear. Nonetheless, they retreat the emerging challenges posed by the rise of the assertive '*Developmental state*' thesis, the continued existence and functioning of single, even communist parties in China, North Korea, and the aggravating financial and economic crisis rocking the foundations of the European Union and America. In precise terms, international relations in the stage of globalization for the scholarly world is like a ship flouting on a high sea without compass.

This compels the major political actors, western states, financial locomotives, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, multilateral organizations like the UNDP and others, even, the World Trade Organization, to study, revise and reinvigorate their former positions prudently to follow pragmatic approaches. The former Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, played an irreversible role in challenging these traditionally neo-liberal establishments first to doubt their views, then, to appreciate in side out developmentalist theses from the World Bank to G8 states, the European Union to the United States. The IMF itself is fast losing its grounds hesitantly joining the pragmatic worldview to the advantages of Ethiopia.

At present, most of these bodies have out rightly cancelled their firm policy reservations

---

motivations. He is critical of the current manifestations of NGOs wanting to change the world without understanding it, and that the imperial relationship continues today with the rise of NGOs.

<sup>19</sup> There is a debate that NGOs take the place of what should belong to popular movements of the poor. Others argue that NGOs are often imperialist in nature, that they sometimes operate in a racist manner in Third World countries and that they fulfill a similar function to that of the clergy during the colonial era. Peter Hallward argues that they are an aristocratic form of politics."

toward, for example, Ethiopia's policy of public ownership of land, protection of the financial and other selected economic sectors, control of foreign currency exchange and the increased involvements of the state and so on. The paradox again is: Where have these NGOs been while this was the reality unfolding here and there? if they were busy filing their value war materials in the fashion of their double standard mentalities and poetic justice against Ethiopia, the are again questionable for the following reasons.

## 5. Calculus and Rhythm of the NGO Value War

Several political scientists argue that Civil Societies are mere *gap fillers* in the void created by the failure of the modern state in the post-globalization to address all limitations. These nature, scope and degrees in the complexities of global problems in the post-Cold War period justify the coming of non-Government Agencies to help the state willingly to effectively cover and handle these global concerns. For these scholars, NGOs could by no means substitute *states* and governments; Civil Societies never replace the United Nations or Regional Organizations, either. They are non-Governmental in the sense that they do not derive their survivals from the will and sponsorship of the state; they could never also try to bend the state to the service of their beliefs as organizations and individuals.

For these scholars, *gap filling* role implies to intervening in selected, deliberated and agreed components of demands for social services left out of government capacity. For the purpose of this paper, however, I must dismiss, for the time being, all these growing scholarly explanations, and temporarily accept that these NGOs can also concern themselves with justice, democracy, and policy as well as government behaviors whenever they think that there are *gaps* here, too. However, do they live up to these minimum expectations and requirements, as the experiences in Ethiopia show? Let us see the following arguments.

These self-appointed international agents have never had symmetrically established attitudes, measurements, norms and moral baselines of appraising environmental and community rights against the demands of socio-economic development practices and policies.<sup>20</sup> Let us take the following comparative cases as evidence of this argument. As implied above, some of them came up with their communiqué in denouncing almost all efforts of Ethiopia at building hydropower plants. In Ethiopia's case, their justifications as usual are what they call negative externalities--environmental hazards and threats on human and community threats. In short, their opposition is with the very ideas and plans of hydropower plans by Ethiopia.

---

<sup>20</sup> See one example: James Pfeiffer, in his case study of NGO involvement in Mozambique, speaks to the negative effects that NGO's have had on areas of health within the country. He argues that over the last decade, NGO's in Mozambique have "fragmented the local health system, undermined local control of health programs, and contributed to growing local social inequality" He notes further that NGO's can be uncoordinated, creating parallel projects among different organizations, that pull health service workers away from their routine duties in order to serve the interests of the NGO's. This ultimately undermines local primary health care efforts, and takes away the governments ability to maintain agency over their own health sector. J. Pfeiffer suggested a new model of collaboration between the NGO and the DPS (the Mozambique Provincial Health Directorate). He mentioned the NGO should be 'formally held to standard and adherence within the host country', for example reduce 'showcase' projects and parallel programs that proves to be unsustainable.

## 5.1. Double Standards

When the concern is in Europe and America, however, this criterion immediately evaporates. They seamlessly replace it with what they call the ‘*adequacy of prior hazard prevention*’ preconditions. In this case, what matters for them has never been the hydropower technology per se but the level of caution taken. These actors refrained from questioning the environmental and community appropriateness of several similar new and upgrading hydro projects in 2012. They made no comments when the European Union Development Bank provided 125 million dollars for East European states, particularly Armenia, for scaling up about 7 hydropower plants. Their voices denied them to shout when Turkey in the 1980s boldly built one of the largest dams in the world across the historically, socially, culturally and politically most sensitive Tigris river flowing into Iraq and Syria.

They also turned a deaf ear when another collection of civil societies in the United States awarded what they call ‘High Quality Standards’ for 7 extremely big hydropower plants producing more than an estimate of 27, 000 megawatts by grossly changing the natural texture of the rivers to the undeniable disadvantages of environment at global level.

These actors have remained quite in 2009 when Germany, one of the largest consumers of nuclear energy, has persisted to date in its continued dependence and utilization of coal energy for its big industries. These actors also zipped their lips when European states and America generously but selfishly subsidized their farmers in billions at the expenses and costs of African farmers. Farmers in developing states in general lost a huge sum of benefits in their helpless competitions with the subsidized farmers of the North. As the result, poor farmers from Africa to Asia and Latin America had, force majeure, turned their faces to cannibalizing their environments for survival<sup>21</sup>. These NGOs were also shy to denounce the practices in the 1980s and 1990s of developed states and their companies of dumping nuclear residues in disposals on African lands.

Their double standards also dominate either their opportunistic or sham expressions of concerns or silences on the human rights situations of developed states as compared to Ethiopia. Time in 2009, for example, reported that out of the total of black Americans within the age group between 21 and 35 years, some 34% are in prisons. Out of 2 million American Muslims, 8.2% are again behind bars. America is also the leading country in

---

<sup>21</sup> These NGOs have never voiced in favor of Ethiopia and the entire Africa when Meles pleaded, representing the Continent, for justice against environmental apartheid in which the North harmed the South but hypocritically tried to instruct the South how to be environment-friendly. These NGOs have never tried to coordinate global mobilization against environmentally the most deadly western philosophic traditions, teachings and existing curricula. These modes of modern education, commonly known as anthropocentric, humanity as the master of nature, originated as early as the 16th century by such philosophers as the French Descartes and the British Francis Bacon have still been teaching their generations that nature is indifferent, created for human use and endlessly replenishing itself so that human beings should now worry. These teachings furnished the worst venue to murdering ecology by speeding up uncritical industrial revolution. I could not imagine that these NGOs and their experts did not know that these classical teachings historically shaped anti-environment attitudes of euro-American successive generations

the number of women and inmates adolescent convicts at correction centers across the globe. America generously finances its prisons some two times more than its universities. Prison administration for Americans is less of a public service than a big private sector investment. Last week, Yahoo news reported that thousands of American prisoners underwent controversially forced labor work on rehabilitating a town smashed by a hurricane.

All these have always been taking place at the eyelids of the Human Rights Watch, ICG, ICJ, Amnesty International and others. For these institutions, whenever it is the United States, what matters is whether standard procedures are in place when the government jails and convicts an American citizen or a foreigner. One could rightly open their websites, read reports on human rights situations in America, and soon finds these actors asking the following questions. Did courts issue a warrant for the suspect before taking one to prison? Was there discriminatory handling of suspects under custody? These are the simplest and probably ABC..., concerns needing the attentions of no Watchdog institution even in the conditions of developing states.

When it comes to Ethiopia and other developing states, however, the rhythm immediately changes: all imprisonments by the Ethiopian police are antihuman rights, political, unprocedural and against the freedom of conscience. In other more critical terms, while the American police have the right to discharge its duty and must be busy with doing its tasks, the Ethiopian police should sit idle until these actors give a nodding head. Here, I am not saying that there are no violations of rules of the law in Ethiopia by the police. There could be such transgressions here and there, as many as there are elsewhere including Europe and America. I would instantly agree if these procedural abuses would be the concerns of these organizations. We can get many lessons. What the band of these organizations rather focuses is on the very right and duty of the Ethiopian state to discharge its constitutional functions.<sup>22</sup>

The diagram of abstractions below could best demonstrate the patterns of the NGO double standard against Ethiopia by taking one common issue of concern in Euro-America as compared to Ethiopia. **Issue of Concern:** there is a report that ‘100 people have been under arrest by chance both in Ethiopia, Europe and United States.’

**Treatments:** the event invited questions by people, and NGOs begin to air their position expressions. Let us see how the NGOs traditionally do the job.

---

<sup>22</sup> The NGOs’ reports and criticisms above are heavily questionable about the professional adequacy and integrity of their experts and decision-makers that provoke the many key questions, for instance. Repeating one of the quizzical titles by one of the NGOs above, the author asks: ‘*Democracy and Development: which should come first?*’ in Ethiopia’s case, the author’s answer is quite predetermined: democracy should come first. However, does not the NGO author know that this question in political science invites an automatic rejection, for it asks, in other words, like, ‘*which one is the first: the chicken or the egg?*’ By what earthly or heavenly epistemological miracles can the NGO professionals against Ethiopia answer this question? So, what is the essence of the bitter criticism against the Ethiopian government for prioritizing development over democracy? What were the experiences of the Anglo-American, the home societies of most of these NGOs, on this question? Is there an NGO expert who can precisely define the border between democracy and growth in England, France, U.S.A or anywhere else?

**Questions****NGO impressions on:**

	<b>Euro-America</b>	<b>Ethiopia</b>
<b>Who arrested the people?</b>	<b>Police</b>	<b>The state, the Government, the Ruling Party</b>
<b>What is the said reason for the arrest?</b>	<b>Violating the law, terrorism, threat on the life of individuals...</b>	<b>Demand for religious, press, conscience, democratic freedom...</b>
<b>What do you guess about the motive behind?</b>	<b>Security, protection of democracy and western civilization from threats</b>	<b>Politics and ideology, authoritarianism. Dictatorship, fear of oppositions</b>
<b>What is the status of the arrested people now?</b>	<b>Suspects</b>	<b>Victims</b>
<b>Where are now the arrestees?</b>	<b>Under police custody</b>	<b>unknown</b>
<b>Who are specifically the people arrested?</b>	<b>Individual citizens, men, women, youngsters</b>	<b>Members of this or that ethnic group or this or that opposition political party</b>

HRW, ICG, AI, ICJ, etc, dare intervening in the politics of sovereign Ethiopia, denouncing the imprisonments of individual citizens by mentioning their names. This action reminds me of the old days of European Protectorate Rules in their colonies during the colonial era. The organization goes to the extents of awarding convicts as ‘heroes’ of human rights and democracy by contemptuously going headlong against the integrities of judicial independence and impartiality among judges. I would again agree with HRW if it rather consulted the Ethiopian government on matters like raising and improving prosecuting and judicial capacity, rapid processes and procedures of adjudication, rules and laws deserving reconsiderations and so on as the conventional moral duty of a self-operating global civil society.

Historical records also show that Amnesty International, for example, shamefully to humanity, refused in the 1960s well up to 1992 to recognize Nelson Mandela as a prisoner victim of racism on his own soils and motherland. The organization retreated from denouncing the actions of the Apartheid regime of the then South Africa openly blaming Mandela as a ‘terrorist’ leader of a constitutionally outlawed secret organization-

ANC against the legitimate government in Pretoria.<sup>23</sup> This organization also failed to express, at least, a human rights concern over American handling of terrorist suspects arrested at Guantanamo Bay. Amnesty International had all the information when American doctors in the 1980s secretly, involuntarily and unofficially tested dangerous vaccines on Nicaraguan inmates. It was however president Obama himself who exposed the secret and officially requested for the public crime.

## **5.2. Is Ethiopia Serving ‘Poetic Justice’<sup>24</sup>?**

This paper stands obviously not only in defense of justice, in general, but also in defense of the current Ethiopia and the regime. Once I traveled more than half the road, it is still critical to realize that one should defend Ethiopia, the Ethiopian incumbent government, and the regime solely on what Management science call ‘management by objective’ or ‘result-based appraisal’. This would answer the usual NGOs’ question whether the Ethiopian government deserves scholarly and citizenry approvals. This discussion will be of help finally to search answers for another question: why do these NGOs prefer ultimately a showdown against the Ethiopian government? First, let us see the practical records of the Ethiopian government in the said specific areas of civil society uproar and criticism in the last two decades.

As compared to other developing states in Africa and elsewhere, there are strong structural and historical reasons that place Ethiopia and its current development policies in a unique category completely. The political crisis in Ethiopia up to 1991, I argue, was because governments before this time failed to work out wholly or partially a development policy that proved consistent with these unique features. The following comparative arguments demonstrate that the current regime interpreted the unique history of Ethiopia correctly in its policies as the following facts support.

Firstly, Ethiopia is the only country in Africa, Eritrea considered, placing land and land resources under public ownership. Technically speaking, land in Ethiopia is not simply, as other state leaders might think, an externally existing economic good in the market; land in Ethiopia is a matter of social status and roles, political issue and economic factor affecting the entire nation. By talking about land in Ethiopia, one could be sure that one is talking about peasant populations of Ethiopia. However, the regime does not worship land; it is practically using land for development including for foreign investment involving, agreeing with ICG, 4 million hectares. This land is not the property of the federal government unlike the practice in the United States. It is land belonging to Regions but its delegation of administration for investment has passed formally to the federal government in Addis. Comparatively assessed, what is the meaning of this?

---

<sup>23</sup> See the guiding constitution and principles of the Amnesty International that it confirms that it will continue to stick to them firmly.

<sup>24</sup> Poetic justice here refers to two misguided and unjust views and judgments of the Ethiopian state. Comrades of the NGOs at home accuse the government of inciting group conflicts by its recognition of collective rights while the NGOs accuse it of violating group rights. Secondly, the Ethiopian government’s priority of rural development is a point of criticism at home while it is linked only with ‘forceful eviction’ by NGOs. This is ‘poetic justice’ because it could mean the Amharic that goes saying: *ehil labedere teter meleslet—return gravels for the one who lends grain*,

In Ethiopia, there is never a single individual, leave alone a community, who lost ties to one's families, or access to water springs and lakes, or foot passages or the way to church and market places because western or eastern foreign companies bought a vast land in the middle and enclosed it with electric fences. This is because of a distinct but realistic policy. In Ethiopia, no citizen who has land at one's hand can ever transfer land to foreign investors under any circumstances. The state is the sole agency for undertaking land provision. Other NGOs like DFID of England very well know that land in other African countries, from Kenya to Uganda, to South Africa to Tanzania is largely private. Individual owners have their right to put their land for sale on domestic or international market. Ethiopia has no a single white settler who has the remote protection of Europe and America and can bend government policy.

Secondly, ICG, AI, IRs, etc, do not want to face the naked truth on the ground. Firstly, as data show, 87% of the Kenyan, 78% of Zimbabwean, 80% of South African, 88% of Ugandan, 75% of Tanzanian and 70% of Algerian agro-industrial economy, for example, is under 11%, 13%, 16%, 12%, 15% and 15% respectively of a few white settler farmers with mechanized technology and their much fewer comprador Africans respectively. Secondly, Ethiopia has more than 15 million hectares of arable land with no single habitat, Ethiopian or foreigner, which requires no eviction of rural households at all. The ICG 4 million-hectare report falls within this land category. Thirdly, the resettlement and villagization programs are evidently part of the overall rural development strategy and have nothing in common with land transfer for investors.<sup>25</sup>

As a cumulative result, there is no any event of police-community, intercommunity, community-investor, etc, clashes and conflicts in Ethiopia. To remind them, some of the experts of these NGOs and I were in South Africa, in 2011, Uganda and Tanzania, in 2012, when rural communities fiercely clashed with government police because they suddenly found foot road ways to grazing lands and water springs iron-fenced and guarded by bought security guards. The NGOs also must remember alarming reports on dried up lakes and defrosted lands in Kenya because of brutal exploitations by horticulture investors from Britain and France in 2011. All these tragic stories are unthinkable in Ethiopia.<sup>26</sup>

---

*I heard recent news that the Human Rights Watch appointed a new Ethiopian Director for the Africa Branch. This man is Daniel Bekele. If he is not by chance another Daniel, (I can correct my mistake) my memory of Daniel Bekelle is a debate in the Constitutional Assembly in 1993 for which he won a seat. The debate was on the notion of the present Article 39.*

---

<sup>25</sup> see Zemen Magazine, 2011.

<sup>26</sup> The House of Representatives issued Rural Land Conservation and Utilization Proclamation in 2004 controversially protecting peasant households and communities against arbitrary eviction or disadvantaged appropriation of their land plots, houses, durable crops and homestead horticultures. According to Article 7 of this document, a rural household has the right to acquire compensations for appropriated land calculated by an index of produce item from among expensive harvest items-teff, wheat, or barely, for example, depending on the type of ecology, by a market estimate of seven years at existing market price, and related

*“I never accept this Article because I am sure there is no a single nationality in Ethiopia, who wants to secede.’ Daniel said.*

*“What would you say, Ato Daniel, if the Somali Nation, for example, says we are not Ethiopians; we want to have our own state?” A woman asked Daniel.*

*“I agree that they can immediately secede; however, they must leave the land of Somali which our fathers brought through their blood.”*

*This is Daneil Bekelle now appointed by the Human Rights Watch to fight for the community rights of the Somali people against the Ethiopian Government.*

---

The poetic justice here at the hands of these NGOs, however, is that Ethiopia is rather the culprit for crimes against environment and community rights.

## **6. If so, what does the NGO Cult demand from Ethiopia?**

*The quick answer for this question is ‘Survival’.* This answer is never hypothetical, assumptive or theoretical. One can simply access the website about the background story of Amnesty International, for example, from the 1960s until now. It narrates proudly about how the organization has managed to survive financial predicaments from which a critical analyst could automatically learn three points.

Firstly, AI and, of course, all so called ‘civil societies’, say they take no material assistance from governments, political parties or affiliates to the stated for fear of political influences. Rather, they say they live on voluntary contributions<sup>27</sup> from individuals, handouts from other charities and funds by corporate organizations like business firms.

Secondly, they say they win the hearts of these donors by convincing them that their interventions were and are truly humanist, irreplaceable and lifesaver projects for victimized targets across the globe.<sup>28</sup> They also show through their proposal documents how states like that of Ethiopia and Africa and their governments are inefficient, at best, and irresponsible, at worst, to address diligently the plights of their own citizens. They produce and show photograph and video evidences demonstrating the lavish and selfish squandering of interstate aid at the hands of Ethiopian and African government leaders before reaching the victimized poor majority. Without these organizations, their

---

<sup>27</sup> See, *The Rise and Fall of Transnational Civil Society: The Evolution of International Non-Governmental Organizations since 1839.* By T. R. Davies city uneversty London, Steve Charnovitz, "Two Centuries of Participation: NGOs and International Governance, Michigan Journal of International Law, Winter 1997.

<sup>28</sup> Boli, J. and Thomas, G. M. (1997) *World Culture in the World Polity: A century of International Non-Governmental Organization.* American Sociological Review. pp. 177 Shivji, Issa G. (2007). *Silence in NGO discourse: the role and future of NGOs in Africa.* Oxford, UK: Fahamu. p. 84 Building unity in diveristy: social movement activism in western Cape Anti-Eviction Campian. Sophie Oldfield & Kristian Stokke, 2004

documents state, millions of human beings are at risk, which the donors themselves could appreciate the agony through their own ways;

Thirdly, the financial donations obtained would annually pay two items of expenditure: overhead costs and furniture. Almost all NGOs fighting against Ethiopia--from HRW to International Rivers--have no any project expenditure where 100% of their payments are for salaries, per diems and other staff entitlements. Overhead costs include monthly salaries, per diems, insurance and many other costs payable to Board Members, Managers at the Headquarters and all Branches across the world, experts, other employees and the entire staff. Furniture costs include office utensils, transport, infrastructures-telephone, light, and other services and purchases and other facility expenditures. I recently read a story that prosecutors caught a Human Rights Watch expert in Congo when paying bribes for witnesses against the government. In short, the organizations, put together, need multimillion pounds and dollars every year a little above the annual budget of some oil rich states.

What do all these stories mean for Ethiopia and other developing states? Undeniably, they mean thousands of things. For convenience, let us only briefly see three of the meanings as one could observe from their own documents.

Firstly, these international organizations could never exist, function and survive in the absence of crises in Ethiopia and Africa. Worse than this, the depths of the crises have to be extremely severe, longer and bloody enough in order to break down the hearts of donors down into senselessness of life amidst tragedies. The donors must feel that they provide contributions rightly for the just cause of humanity that lacks immediate supporting hands from their own governments. It is most likely the donors extend their emotionally picked generous handouts because they are not governments with adequate information, policy and institutional framework to determine the meanings of crisis. At times, the governments of donor individuals and firms themselves are as bad those governments of Ethiopia and Africa pursuing their own selfish political goals only. Thus, their donations are not only worth giving permanently but also growingly;

Secondly, the organizers, board and staff members of these organizations must convince their donors on two critical scores: one is that they argue these staffs have the best opportunities to the pursuit of most luxurious lives in Europe and America, their home countries. They prefer joining civil societies by the dictate of their humanist and moralist beliefs to sacrifice altruistically themselves for the benefits of remote populations, mercilessly ignored by their rulers, undergoing subhuman sufferings. The second is that which follows from the first; the salaries and entitlements paid to these international altruistic international moralists is always far less than their sacrifices in the barren corners of the earth. Donors therefore should feel morally still behind the right line of contribution as compared to the hardships the civil society staffs have been facing. This shows that these civil societies could exist and operate only in the prevalence of the last morale residue, which scholars call 'appeal to pity' rather than 'appeal to rationality' and courage;

Thirdly, these international organizations now have the most important portion of their survival inputs-enough money from those who have it<sup>29</sup>. Next, they should safely secure entrance inlet into the target countries and a standing ground among populations who lack both the money and the information. This compels them to devise working approaches, operational and ethical guidelines and organizational policies that convince the governments of recipient states.

Where could these organizations fetch these policy guidelines? The answer is immediate that they automatically borrow it from the belief systems of their donors, societies, thinkers, scholars and governments and nowhere else<sup>30</sup>. Operationally, individualism, free market rules, limited state, monetarism and others fill the blank lines of their policy paper. They tell their recipient governments and the professionals they employ that the sources of all social quagmires in their countries were lack of these principles. Ethically, they propose such shams like neutrality, humanity, impartiality, etc. The tenet is that individual donors have less influence on the ideological and ethical gridlines of the civil societies, about which the former lack either the knowledge or the interest.<sup>31</sup> Traditionally, donors tend to believe that many poor people suffer in Ethiopia and Africa simply because the views, policies and practices of governments must be wrong.

To achieve their goals as designed, one can remember the forum of about 16 international civil societies under the coordination of Amnesty International, which sat in 2006 to draft and ratify their common and global operational and ethical constitutions. They sat themselves for the task, according to Amnesty International, because they were independent from state controls and interventions. Governments, which refuse to accept these principles for one or other reasons, according to these organizations, are subject to entry into blacklist as *international pariah* revolting against the sacred and universally accepted ruling principles of humanity.

With no debate at all, Ethiopia is one of these few states not as blunt and crooked as Eritrea, but, at the same time, not submissive and easygoing like the majority of others. The Civil Society Regulation Proclamation 621/2009, which the Ethiopian government issued, is living evidence that testifies Ethiopia's unusually bold step in turning their background ideology upside down against their belief.

---

<sup>29</sup> Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (2002) NGO Performance and Accountability: Introduction and Overview. "In: Edwards, M. and Hulme, D., ed. 2002." The Earthscan Reader on NGO Management. UK: Earthscan Publications Ltd. Chapter 11.

<sup>30</sup> Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (2002) NGO Performance and Accountability: Introduction and Overview. "In: Edwards, M. and Hulme, D., ed. 2002." The Earthscan Reader on NGO Management. UK: Earthscan Publications Ltd. Chapter 11.

<sup>31</sup> Weber, N. and Christopherson, T. (2002) The influence of non-governmental organizations on the creation of Natura 2000 during the European policy process. Forest policy and Economics. Anheier, H. and Themudo, N.(2002) Organisational forms of global civil society: Implications of going global. In: Anheier, H. Glasius, M. Kaldor, M, ed 2002.

This proclamation brought the self-appointed human rights tutors from their imaginary throne in the cloud down to the earth to meet Ethiopian terms unconditionally.

## **Conclusions**

NGOs waging value war on Ethiopia clearly understand that their attacks have failed to achieve their goals. This paper shows that Ethiopia's rise leaves them out behind. Thus, they had to redouble their efforts by using rosy neo-liberal terms as a drum to attract ears everywhere particularly from their donors. Ethiopia here stands as their scapegoat with her pessimistic past as a nostalgic evidence for setting her as a target of the value war. Double standards and poetic justice are the rhythms of their warfare. Why do they suffer all these? It is nothing else but survival of the belly.

The insistence of the Ethiopian government in its development policy has challenged these NGOs two times: the developed states and IMF and the World Bank reduced the NGOs to the status of 'good for nothing'. There has never been a single case of policy reconsideration by these powers against Ethiopia as the result of influence by the NGOs. Secondly, that Ethiopia is completely stable with a fast growing record of development has left them either with faint agenda or forced them to focus on specific and localized concerns like Somali and Gambela Regions.