

Ideological war by pen and gun by tongue and teeth

Amen Teferi Feb 19, 2012

A couple week ago, watching the televised session of the Federal Parliament and listening to the government quarterly performance report of the Prime Minister, wherein he respond to the queries and concerns of the MPs prompted by his report, I chanced to hearken to an ever intriguing issue related to the decries made by some international organizations against the Ethiopian government.

We know that, the previous month, two international Human Right groups had issued a joint statement. And we used to hear repeated condemnations of these sorts for a decade now. Now, the fire that lit the fuse for a succession of loud explosions, the noisiest of which came from the *Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International* seems to be prompted by the ongoing settlement of people in Gambela on one hand, and the public trial and conviction of some journalists by an ordinary court of law for actions related with terrorism, on the other hand.

The joint statement issued by *Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International* was “calling on Ethiopian authorities to stop using anti-terrorism laws to stifle political dissent.” This unusual joint statement comes as some journalists are being tried in terrorism related cases by the competent Federal Courts in Addis Ababa. One amongst these cases is a case filed against two Swedish journalists who are accused of and convicted for being an ally to an insurgent group which was named by the Federal Parliament as a terrorist force – the ONLF.

Other than these organizations some Western government declared that they will “continue to engage the Ethiopian government for the respect of press freedom in the country.” And they are exerting a weighty pressure to limit, so as to effect the release of these two Swedish journalists. Without hesitating to check the explicit implication of their action or conduct, even for a moment, they are employing every possible means to get these Swedish journalists out of prison.

Though, this was a business as usual for many of us, concerned about the stunning statement made by these international organizations, one member of the parliament raised a question wondering why these organizations make the loudest voice demonizing the Ethiopian government.

In response to this question the Prime Minister has made it clear that the accusation is routinely off base. The Premier took some time to explain the reason why these international agencies habitually opted to belittle his government by relentlessly issuing unfounded statements.

He spelled it clearly that the motive behind those statements was politics and ideology. He told us in an unequivocal manner that it was an offshoot of ideological war. It is of course a matter out in the open. It is all about an ideological war: a war 'by pen and gun, by word and bullet, by tongue and teeth.' These international organizations have an ideological mission of a liberal philosophy that severs a real political and economic agenda of the "Breton Wood" oligarchy.

Driven by this hideous motive, these supra-national organizations would pick up every trivia to denounce those who "follow a different path of development other than that subscribed by the West and have a clear sign of success in their venture." Then they will, as a matter of course, be out of sorts. Feel unwell or be in a bad mood and come out with condemnations just picking up their cloth out of the peg.

Just like having a temper tantrum over a lost paper clip, they would come out and deprecate the "heretics." If the "heretics" tried to explain their position, then, they would peevishly retorted "orders is orders!" And the order given must be obeyed, no matter how strange or ridiculous you may feel it is.

And Prime Minister Meles Zenawi readily reacted to this question saying that it is an ideologically prompted war not only against the Ethiopian governments in particular but against governments in third world who charted and ploughing their own pathway that seem to be successful in general.

He made it clear that however much we may try; they would not abstain or we cannot even insulate ourselves from their denigration. The only options we have at hand are to kneel down to their pressure or keep on moving resolutely on a path that avail our people without compromising our sovereignty. This is the dire price we must pay, biting the bullet. To decide going our own way and to wish to be adorned by their blessing would be a fall between two stools. Our sordid options are giving deaf ear to

their ideologically driven statements and keep on treading along our own way. It is a done and dusted issue the Ethiopian government chose the latter.

As the premier recapitulated it in a short and snappy story, there is also an attitude that would be evocative of the colonial era. People in the third world would always carry with them many sights, sounds, tastes, and smells of colonialism. And some reminisces of the colonization era in our memories would bring a smile to our face. The Premier has epitomized the deplorable attitude of colonizers in an anecdote he narrated in reaction to the questions raised by MPs regarding the international human right organizations.

Though Ethiopia has never been colonized by any Western colonial power, Prime Minister Meles Zenawi had a story tell us about a senior British colonial official in Kenya who drop in Addis back in the days.

This British colonial official was astonished when no passenger rose from his chair seeing a white man like himself entering into a bus. Totally oblivious of his where about, forgetful of fact that he was in bus running along the street of Addis Ababa, that colonial official fancied that the passengers on board to would leave him their seat in jiffy when he get on the bus. That is crap!

But what he encountered was something exotically different, absurd and offensive to what he assumed as a proper conduct of a black man in the presence of a white. Up on which he went emotional and exclaimed, "This is scandalous, this is outrageous!"

That is all because the passengers of the bus in Addis were behaving against what he customarily expected of a black man. To his surprise, these black Ethiopians continued to be seated where they are. "They haven't noticed" he might have thought, "that a white man is standing here." Dumbfounded by what he saw he yelled, "This is scandalous!" Hence, he might have concluded that Ethiopians are quite "uncultured" as they are not leaving a chair in for a white man.

These international organizations and their allies whom some commentators would like to refer as 'financial barons' will always be nauseated in seeing someone walking his own way and they will call the shots. And make every effort harness the "heretics." Therefore, the statements issued by these supra-national organizations are instrumental to make the "heretics" kneel down. This was the gist of the Premier's reaction to the question forwarded by the MP.

And I fully endorse the Premier's opinion. That is the truth, and the rest is commentary. That is the truth, and rest is footnote. But out of naiveté one may ask why these supra-national organizations pin their efforts at this "scandalous" doings. Then let us see the "footnotes."

In the following discussion I shall indicate to you the basic facts upon which I draw my conclusion. What I try to present here may be an affair which the west does not like to note and/or discuss. But opening the historical baggage will show us how fierce the ideological battle we are bound to engaged in as Third World nation.

There are groupings of powerful families in the West who would like to have a permanent control over the major resources of the world, the financial firms and other institutions and through them, over an important number of officials in the government the poor and rich nations.

I espouse the belief that these supra-national organizations like the *Human Rights Watch* and *Amnesty International* are serving the interests of its 'financial and political barons' in the west. If any third world administration tends to resist any policy that would be forced upon them, then, as the premier said, it would be excommunicated as 'heretic.'

And organizations like *Human Rights Watch*, *Amnesty International*, *International Monetary Fund*, *World Bank* are enforcers of this policy. These are the enforcer of the bankrupted policy of "Breton Woods" and its vassal states.

The foreign policy of the West is and was conducted to enforce the looting of the developing world nations through the policy of "IMF Conditionality's." And humanitarian aid, press Freedom and human right issues are a bulwark for ideological war. These supra-national financial organizations based in the west are tools for economic blackmail aimed at the poor third world nations, whose dependence on aid and developmental assistance of the west is significant.

Issues pertaining to human and democratic rights such as voluntary settlement and press freedom are tools to force the poor nations back down to the demands of the west. Those who stood unbendingly to fight the obscenity of the politically embedded neo-liberal economic policies prescriptions would be punished.

The problem these supra-national organizations have with the EPRDF government is that it dauntingly refused to implement the blindly prescribed policies of the Western government. Therefore they are devoting most of their effort scheming how to prevent this government from getting to its goals. Despite the relentless efforts made by such organizations to discredit the superb achievements of the Ethiopian government in various sectors, they could not put the government in harness. Hence, their game plan failed.

However, they have never been done with talking of freedom. Yet they murder freedom every where they find it, at the corner of every one of our streets, in all corners of the globe. For centuries they have stifled almost the whole of humanity in the name of civilization.

When we get fed up and say something in a worn out voice they will find it contemptuous. And they react saying “who dares to speak thus?” We are telling the true facts of our life. A truth that is unpleasant not only to listen to, but also stale to even utter. It is a truth that we convinced of in the marrow of our bones. We are saying that we are not done for slavery. And this is not an emotional talk but a talk burning with fury. See, the truth stood naked.

We are trying get out of the quagmire of poverty. Make every effort to consolidate our transitional democracy. But the hired ‘kinglets,’ sham from beginning to end, whom Sartre might have named as ‘a walking lies’, preferred it with clothes on. They want us to buy their trash and love their artificial truths not less than mothers are loved. They simply echoed the voice of Western oligarchy and the ideologically-made truths.

And they are always ready, like our “guest” from the colonial Kenya, to accuse us of not being faithful to them and for being scandalous. We African have tried to be so in the colonial era for some time. We listened to the former colonial masters with unbelievable patience. But now a new generation came on the scene. Now, we are done with that. Alas, but they are not. And they are telling us often times that if their instructions are not carried out to the letters, then and only then our economies will bankrupt and our countries will go to pieces. They voiced a threat that always be followed by a piece of advice muddled by a colonial attitude. That is what Melse tried to say.

Meles was speaking of you, but never to you. He only speaks for his brothers in the Third World or his countrymen. He did so just mentioning, in passing, the well-known attitude of the colonial period. He

doesn't waste his time in condemning the international organizations; he simply picked up a story just to demonstrate the pervasive legacy of colonialism in our era. He tacitly indicated the complex play of the new global affairs. And his aim was to declare the bluffing game of the neo-liberals. In short, the Third world finds itself and speaks to itself through his voice. He speaks to the people living on this part of the globe who are forced to live in a constant menace of the western tacit aggression.

No intention of fanning the flames and have no interest of making an argument more intense by use of provocative language. If anything of this kind shown up here I would like to apologize that it is not done deliberately but accidentally.

Let me revert to my starting point, and open the historical baggage. Opening it we will find a report published 32 years ago and titled as "The Real Story behind *Trilateral Commission*" (*Issued by Lyond LaRouche*).

The commission is a group of 300 powerful public figures from North America, Japan, and Western Europe, formed in 1973 with advice and guidance from the Council on Foreign Relations and from British aristocrats.

One hundred and ten members of the commission are Americans, and 27 of them had been serving in the carter administration. This includes President Carter, Vice President Mondale, Secretary of state Vance, Secretary of Defense Brown, and others. David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger's piggy bank, is accorded the honor of calling himself the founder of the Commission.

The liberal Eastern Establishment, for which the *Trilateral Commission* is a special purpose instrumentality for a limited period of time, is a grouping of powerful families in New York, Boston, Connecticut and elsewhere, which exercise permanent control over the nation's major universities, investment bank, law firms, and federal civil service, and through them, over an important number of manufacturing corporations. This control per se does not necessarily have to be evil. It is the purpose to which it is used, the policy to which it is used that makes it evil or good.

The principal use, to which this social power has been used increasingly and decisively since the accession to power of President Woodrow Wilson, is to control the foreign policy of the United States on behalf of the ruling aristocracy of Great Britain. The Eastern Establishment itself is not the center of ultimate power; it is an instrumentality on behalf of policies of the British oligarchy.

Most Americans up on being informed of this fact react with credulity, even the most committed anti-liberals among them. It is however an easily proved fact that they are driven by unbending opposition to sovereignty of the nation of the world.

The *Trilateral Project* also indicated that the US is known for its systematic refusal to support any programs that aims at the industrial development of the Third World, hence its focus is 'ruralization and deindustrialization.'

Trilateral Commission was formed in 1973 to institute a London-New York leadership over the rest of the Western Alliance. But it was increasingly challenged as, in the post World War II, liberal economic system was discernibly going to pieces.

On the other hand, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and also American nationalist forces were proposing a new orientation in favor of a commitment for renewed industrial development worldwide. Such a policy would have meant industrialization of key sectors of the Third World and thus the eventual emergence of new, sound, and strong nations.

The report also mentioned that instituting a London-New York leadership was a repeat of the British nightmare at the turn of the 19th century. It further indicated that such a policy would also have meant that France, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Japan, with their special relation with Third World nations, would experience an industrial boom, as their economies mobilized to provide the capital goods needed by the new nations."

In the beginning of 1973 two things happened. One, the *Trilateral Commission* was formed. Two, Henry Kissinger manufactured the 1973 October War in the Middle East, which ruined the oil supplies of both Western Europe and Japan. Kissinger, holding the oil weapon over the allies' heads, forced them to go slow and relent. And it took European industries three years to recover from that shock.

The Trilateral Commission, a special-purpose team, is a gathering of influential individuals from North America, Europe, and Japan, all of whom share the same liberal, anti-nationalist philosophy of the British oligarchy and all of whom cooperate to prevent the national forces within their respective countries from exerting influence on policy. This commission has an errands of manipulating presidential elections and circulating policy papers prepared by known scholars with such provocative ideas as, "The

end of Democracy”, “Zero Growth,” and so forth to influence the public opinion and government policy and action.

The document that discuss *Trilateral Commission project 1980* has also disclosed that “ a man who enjoys the reputation of being New York’s stupidest banker, David Rockefeller, was induced and manipulated to take all the credit for the operation.”

The mother entity of the *Trilateral Commission* was The New York Council for Foreign Relations. The Council had termed its 1980s Project as “the largest single effort in our 55-years history...It is aimed at describing how world trends might be steered towards a particular desirable future out come.”

The council published its findings in a 30 volumes series of books published by McGraw-Hill. The strategic objectives outlined in the 1980s Project books are the strategic objectives of both the Carter administration and the *Trilateral Commission’s* next candidates for the White House. Three of the six strategic objectives of the Project are “restore an old-style colonial world through the doctrine of limited sovereignty. And develop a series of alternative paths for arriving at these specified [six] objectives. Finally, conduct United States foreign policy for the purpose of compelling all other nations to choose among these ‘alternative paths’.” There you are!

The strategic objectives do not proceed from the assumption that the main strategic conflict in the world is “Socialism versus capitalism” or “East versus West,” or the “Soviet Union versus the United States.” As Richard Ullman puts it, “The political and economic relations between rich and poor countries promise to remain central issues on the international agenda for the indefinite future. The 1980s Project has devoted considerable attention to the likely and desirable evolution of these relations.... ‘North and South’ issues between rich and poor societies infuse most of the Project’s work.”

According the author of the Project, the main political threat from the “South” is the potential tendency of going against the British liberal school of thought. The most concise presentation of the Council’s concern is presented by the Council’s author and editor of the London *Economist* the late Fred Hirsch, in his book, *Alternatives to the Monetary Disorder*.

He saw an increasing trend of politicization of economic matters. He asserted that “Economic matters that were once dealt with at a technical level or left entirely to the outcome of market forces are increasingly the subject of international diplomacy.” The various economic summit conferences are the

diplomatic forums of the leading economic powers of the West. We are seeing explicit politicization of economic matters. Therefore we are encountering a danger of increased political friction and economic disruption that has resulted from the substitution of political decisions for market or technical influences.

As the Western government see politicization as a threat to both economic prosperity and political harmony. So in their opinion, the containment and reversal of the trend towards increasing politicization are taken among the most urgent international problem of the future.

But eventually they were compelled to make strategic admission about political economy which was not the case in the past. But the Marxists and the neo-mercantilists believe that there are implicit and explicit political attitudes working in the economic activities. They emphasized the political roles embodied in economic relations.

Hence, the aim set by the western block is to create a framework capable of containing the increased level of politicization that emerges naturally from the changed balance of forces in both domestic economies and the international system. The function of the loosened international economic order would be to provide such a framework by setting bounds to arbitrary national action and thereby containing the tendencies toward piecemeal unilateral action and bilateral bargaining that may ultimately be detrimental to the interests of all parties concerned.

This would mean to all intents and purposes that international organizations like World Health Organization and Amnesty or World Trade Organization, NATO, International Monetary Fund or World Bank etc are serving "Breton Wood" oligarchy or the London- New York capitalist grouping.

The west, when necessary, accedes to bypass all constitutionally constituted powers in domestic framework and tramping the sovereignty of nations in the international arena so as to carry out whatever they deemed necessary to their national interests.

They do the same in the economic sectors. Though they harshly criticize the intervention made by the governments of third world countries, they try to manipulate their economies when they see it necessary.

The western governments, faced with the greatest threat to their economies, have entered into an unprecedented intervention and went headlong to kill the philosophical holy cows in their effort to do “whatever is necessary” to head off the disaster. The US treasury Secretary, Henry Paulson, said that “these measures are not intended to take over the free market but to preserve it.” While the some critics labeled this move as having the hallmarks of a socialist model, the western government continues to take various measures that go against the adulated free market. While they rebuked and demonized African governments who are ploughing their own path based on the political and economic realities of their respective countries.

African Business, (November 2008) quote Joseph Stiglitz, former chief economist of the World Bank as saying that “People around the world once admired us [the US] for our economy and we told them if you want to be like us here is what you have to do – hand over power to the market. The point now is that no one has respect for that kind of model anymore given the crisis. And this of course raises questions about our credibility. Everyone feels they are suffering because of us.”

Facing a bad time the UK PM Gordon Brown had not simply bitten the bullet and accepted the economic difficulty without complaining. He rather effectively nationalized some of the country’s major banks. By slaying the capitalist god, as commentators have described the move, Brown appears, at least for time being, to have saved his country banking system from destruction. However, there are economists who claim that danger that will crash down the British economy is waiting in the corner. And commentators are also arguing “as UK fell off the cliff, it would drag down all other institutions tied to it- including banks in Asia and Latin America.”

Brown’s move was a signal for the rest of the world to follow suit. Hence, President Bush, announced “an unprecedented and aggressive” program and the US treasury decided to pump \$250bn (before the recent bail out) into nine leading banks by buying minority stakes in each.

The bank, including such giants as JP- Morgan, Citigroup, Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, the Bank of America and well Fargo, were given little choice in the matter “Government owning a stake in any private US company is objectionable to most Americans- me included,” said US Treasury Secretary, Henry Paulson above. All the same, they did it indeed “when they see it necessary.”

The idea behind buying stakes in the banks was to restore some confidence in the system. The governments have effectively backed the stocks and, if needed, will pour in more money. This, they hoped, would reassure depositors that their money is safe and encourage the banks to resume normal trade. Following this the banks, in the US and the UK, were told to start lending to each other, to businesses and to the housing market.

This unprecedented intervention, in fact, was an unthinkable option only days before Brown's decision. Prompted by the real fear that the banking meltdown would trigger a recession of such magnitude, the Western and by association the global economies have gone spiral into a dark hole.

And overwhelmed with claims they cannot pay, in the case of AIG; the US government stepped in and nationalized the insurance company, having earlier nationalized the country's two largest mortgage underwriters, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

Achille Mbembe, a research professor in history and politics at the University of the Witwatersand in South Africa told to *African Business* that, "Africa is undergoing a complex, if at times painful, process of transformation and multiple transitions at the same time." Of course, things embedded in a democratization process are breakdown of authoritarian system. They are engaged in a difficult task of democratic transition and consolidation. Democratic consolidation is an analytically differentiated aspect of the process of democratization. The processes of transition and consolidation overlap and sometimes coincide, but they are conceptually distinct. Transition to democracy is concerned with the installation of democratic institutions, whereas consolidation is concerned with making democratic institutions enduring and functional and connecting them to civil society.

Studies of transition emphasize factors such as the absence of a strong middle class, the prevalence of an authoritarian political culture, economic dependency, and the role of political elites. Consequently, the transition process becomes the product of strategic calculation by political elites.

For US political analyst Bill Naiman, America's paradigm of engagement with the African continent is too heavily shrouded in ideology and dependent on too narrow a definition of US national security interests.

"In theory," enjoins Achille Mbembe, "strengthening democratic institutions is a major objective of US policy in Africa. In reality, there are very limited funds for Africa within US worldwide democracy

programs and no articulated strategy to address the major challenges constitutional rule faces in the continent.”

In a contribution to South Africa’s *Sunday Independent* newspaper, Mbembe says that between 2000 and 2004, US multilateral aid to Africa has doubled from \$2.05bn to \$4.3bn. Bilateral aid has tripled from \$1.1bn to \$3.2bn. But nearly half of this money is for emergency assistance. Geared towards short-term priorities, US aid assistance is so fragmented as to be almost entirely ineffective. For the past 10 years, long-term investment for growth has remained static. On the contrary, the external stock of capital held by Africans overseas is estimated at \$700bn to \$800bn- more than the total foreign aid assistance to the continent since independence.

Mbembe also contends that China’s forceful entry onto Africa’s developmental stage has muddied the waters for the US in its interaction with Africa and Obama will find it trickier to engage with African countries than previous administrations.

As Beijing offers African Countries relatively beneficial trade deals combined with aid, US trade policies still constitute a major obstacle to Africa’s integration into the world economy. China has placed a high priority on maintaining strong ties with its African energy suppliers. It has invested heavily in infrastructure, treating infectious diseases and expending training and exchange programs. A strict policy of non- interference in internal affairs is the rule.

However, the West wants to enforce by force its interest based on a distorted interpretations of the situation in Africa. The primary concern is examining the situation in Africa with more specificity and more attention to their national and ideological interest is a problem of the “political and financial barons” of the West. That is why they engaged themselves in ideological war ‘by pen and gun, by word and bullet, by tongue and teeth.’

The Ethiopian government is working with a vision that a better tomorrow will happen through its own effort. Therefore, it is working day in and out to make this vision a reality. Those programs and projects (like settlement program and the construction of dams) the western supra-national organizations ceaselessly vilifying are instrumental to this vision. Frustrating this effort in any manner would, in my opinion, be a moral crime.

The German scholar Karl Jaspers distinguished four kinds of guilt: criminal guilt, political guilt, moral guilt, and what he called 'metaphysical guilt.' According to Jaspers, criminal guilt involved the violation of national and international laws and would be determined by trials of accused individuals in courts of law. The political guilt is a collective and involves the liability of a given group or nation. However, Political guilty does not establish a moral guilt. A moral guilt concerns individuals who must answer in their own conscience the question of whether they lived in moral disguise, or with a false conscience, or in self-deception, or in a state of inactivity for example during the Hitler period. The metaphysical guilt is defined as the lack of 'absolute solidarity with the human being as such' and found its expression in the feeling of guilt, for instance, at being alive when one's Jewish neighbors were being taken away. I think those who work in the *Human Rights Watch* and *Amnesty international* are doing their business in a manner that results in a moral guilt and 'metaphysical guilt.'