



College of Social Sciences and Humanities
Department of Civics and Ethical Studies

Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of Ethiopia (CESt 3066) Lecture Note

Prepared By: Fasil Solomon

April 2020

CHAPTER ONE

UNDERSTANDING FOREIGN POLICY

1.1. Defining Foreign Policy

Foreign policy is one of the wheels with which the process of international politics operates. Foreign policy is not separate from the national policy, instead it is a part of it. It consists of national interests that are to be furthered in relation to other states. Almost all the states determine the course of their foreign policies within the limits of their strengths and the realities of the external environment. The nonpolitical relations also fall in the scope of foreign policy.

The term ‘foreign policy’ has been defined in number of ways. George Modelski defines it as, *“The system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment”*. Modelski, in his definition, has emphasized only those aspects of policy, which aim at the change in the existing behaviour of states, as the primary objectives of foreign policy. In fact, foreign policy includes both the change in the existing behaviour and continuation of the behaviour at different times. It is concerned both with the change and the status quo in so far as they serve the national interests (George Modelski, 1962, pp.6-7).

Northedge considers foreign policy to be the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their law making power in a manner desired by the state concerned. It is an interaction between forces originating outside the country’s borders and those working within them (F.S. Northedge, 1968, pp. 6-7). Joseph Frankel writes that foreign policy *“consists of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others (Joseph Frankel, 1968, p. 1)”*.

Hugh Gibson defines foreign policy as *“a well-rounded, comprehensive plan, based on knowledge and experience, for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world. It is aimed at promoting and protecting the interests of the nation. This calls for a clear understanding of what, whose interests are and how far we can help to go with the means at our disposal. Anything less than this falls short of being a national foreign policy (Hugh Gibson, 1944, p. 9)”*.

Thus, foreign policy is the analysis of the actions of a nation - state (motivated by its interest) toward the external environment and the domestic conditions under which these actions are conceived and formulated. In sum, foreign policy is essentially the instrumentality by which states influence or seek to influence the external world and to attain objectives that are in conformity with their perceived national interest.

Foreign policy cannot exist in a vacuum. Foreign policy of a particular state evolves from historical events responsible for creation/strengthening of the statehood, principles and ideological foundations of nation-building, and purpose and interests of the State. Foreign policy can be comprehended only in the greater milieu of form of the government, economic situation, political conditions, geographical situation and general culture of the country. All the foreign policy decisions aim at achieving either cooperation/co-existence or conflict or neutrality towards a particular state or group of states or rest of the world.

1.2. Foreign Policy and National Interest

National interest is adopted as a means or device for analyzing fundamental objectives of foreign policy of a nation - state. It is regarded as those purposes which the nation, through its leadership pursues persistently through time. National interest is also some ideal set of purposes which a nation should seek to realize in the conduct of its foreign relations.

Foreign policy is predicated on the national interest of a nation state, and any foreign policy that fails to reflect the country's national interests is doomed to the general disenchantment of the populace. National interest covers three outstanding components of national security; protection and preservation of the welfare of the state, and national prestige. National security relates to the defense of a country's territory integrity and political independence. Foreign policy on the other hand is the aspect of national policy that pertains to the external environment and involves the enunciation of principles and also indicates a country's positions on major international issues thus foreign policy is concerned with the substance and conduct of external relations.

National interest is perhaps one of most controversial concepts in International Relations. The controversy is due to several factors. Firstly, the concept has been and continues to be the subject of different interpretation by both analysts and practitioners. Secondly, the concept has been a subject of abuse particularly by politicians and decision-makers all over the world. Thirdly, the

concepts is not easily susceptible to analysis. Generally every nation has the foreign policy which -seeks to achieve its national interest.

In the opinion of Arnold Wolfers, when people say that a state's policy should reflect her national interest, what they have in mind essentially is that they desired to see the makers of national policy rise about the narrow and special economic interests of parts of the nation and focus their attentions on the more inclusive interest of the whole nation. When statesmen and bureaucrats are expected or required to act in the national interest, it means that they are to take action on issues that improve the political situation, the economic and social well-being, the health and culture of the people as well as their political survival. They are urged to act on improving the lot of the people rather than pursue policies that will subject the people to domination by other countries.

Joseph Frankel attempted a definition of the national interest from three analytical perspectives i.e. aspirational, operational and polemic. At the aspirational level, the concept refers to the "vision of the good life, to some ideal set of goals which the states would like to realize if this were possible". However, the identifiable ideal goal of the state needs to be attainable immediately as it could be a long term objective. At the operational level, Frankel argues that national interest means the sum total of interests and policies actually pursued.. At the polemic level, the concept refers to "the use of the concept in political argument in real life to explain, evaluate, rationalize or criticize international behavior. It is used to prove one's self right and one's opponent wrong".

1.3. Foreign Policy Making

Foreign policy decision-making whether in a democratic or dictatorial states, is limited by an intricate web of government and social restraints. This web can be understood in terms of three general aspects of foreign policy making: (1) types of government, (2) types of situations and (3) types of policy.

1.3.1. Types of Government

One variable that affect the foreign policy process is a country's type of domestic political system. It is important that we classify political systems such as democratic and authoritarian

governments as a preliminary step to studying their variance in policy and process. This is because differences in the process (how policy is decided) results in differences in policy substance (which policy is adopted.).

The differences between democratic governments and authoritarian government is not exact. However, the standard that differentiates the two is how many and what types of people can participate in making political decision(s). For example, in Canada, political participation is extensive, because only few adults are formally excluded from the political process. In other countries such as China and North Korea, participation is limited to an elite based on an individual's political party, economic standard and social or some other factor (Nathan 1998).

The second criterion for judging forms of government is how many forms of participation available: For example, in the United States, political dissent is public, frequent, often strident, and touches on issues ranging from the president's foreign and domestic policies through his personal life. By contrast, China tolerates very little open disagreements with government's policy. Although the government in Beijing has tried to present a less authoritarian image in recent years, there are still instances of arrest of dissidents, the oppression of minorities (especially Muslims and Tibetans, the lack of democracy, and other restrictions on political and civil rights.

1.3.2. Types of Situations

Irrespective of the form of government, policy-making process is not always the same. Situation is one variable that determines the exact nature of the foreign policy process. For example, there are differences in policy making in crisis situations compared to non-crisis situations. A crisis is a circumstance in which decision makers are (1) surprised by an event (2) feel threatened (especially military), and (3) believe that they have only a short time in which to make a decision (Brecher and Wilkenfield 1997). The more intense each of the three factors is, the more acute the sense of crisis.

Decision makers usually strive during a crisis to make rational decisions, but their ability to gather and analyze information is hampered by the exigency of time. Anxiety or anger engendered by a crisis often increase the emotional content of decisions. Thus, with limited information, little time to think, and with heightened emotions, leaders rely heavily on

preexisting images. The result of these is that only rarely does a coherent picture emerge. This means that decision-makers will respond to a situation according to the images they already have. If leaders, for example, perceive another country as aggressive and if that country mobilizes its forces during a crisis, then decision maker will probably see that act as preparing for attack rather than a preparation for defense.

1.3.3. Types of Policy

Policies are of various types. How foreign policy is decided also varies according to the nature of the issue area involved. Analyzing this depends on the idea that issues that address different subject areas will be decided by different decision makers and by different process. Arguably presidents and other leaders have greater power to decide foreign policy than they do to determine domestic policy. Domestic policy is an area in which legislatures, interest groups, and even public opinion play a greater role.

One explanation for this argument may be that many policies are neither purely domestic nor purely foreign. Instead they have elements of both policy types (foreign and domestic), and thus, constitute a third type called *intermestic policy*. Foreign trade is a classic example of an *intermestic* issue because it affects both international relations and domestic economy in terms - of jobs, prices and other factors. The influence of political leaders is less on such *intermestic* issues because they, like domestic issues, directly impact and activate interest groups, legislators, and other sensational actors more than do foreign policy issues. It follows that presidential leadership is strongest on pure foreign/defense policy issues, weaker on mixed (*intermestic*) issues, and weakest on pure domestic issues (Rourke and Boyer, 2003).

Generally, the process of foreign policy involves a number of stages, including;

- 1. Assessment of the international and domestic political environment:** Foreign policy is made and implemented within an international and domestic political context, which must be understood by a state in order to determine the best foreign policy option. For example, a state may need to respond to an international crisis.
- 2. Goal setting:** A state has multiple foreign policy goals. A state must determine which goal is affected by the international and domestic political environment at any given time. In addition, foreign policy goals may conflict, which will require the state to prioritize.

3. **Determination of policy options:** A state must then determine what policy options are available to meet the goal or goals set in light of the political environment. This will involve an assessment of the state's capacity to implement policy options and an assessment of the consequences of each policy option.
4. **Formal decision making action:** A formal foreign policy decision will be taken at some level within a government. Foreign policy decisions are usually made by the executive branch of government. Common governmental actors or institutions which make foreign policy decisions include: the head of state (such as a president) or head of government (such as a prime minister), cabinet, or minister.
5. **Implementation of chosen policy option:** Once a foreign policy option has been chosen, and a formal decision has been made, then the policy must be implemented. Foreign policy is most commonly implemented by specialist foreign policy arms of the state bureaucracy, such as a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or State Department. Other departments may also have a role in implementing foreign policy, such as departments for trade, defense and finance.

1.4. Foreign Policy Objectives

The objectives of foreign policy are divided in three categories namely, *core values and interests, middle-range objectives and universal long-range objectives.*

1.4.1. Core Values and Interests

Core values and interests determine the foreign policy of a nation. The bases of these objectives are those necessities and beliefs on which the existence of the state depends. Core values and interests can be described as those kinds of goals for which most people are willing to make ultimate sacrifices. States seek to safeguard these core objectives at all costs. It has no time to delay or postpone the fulfilling of these objectives. The state has to girdle itself to realize these objectives directly, quickly, forcefully and effectively; it has no luxury of time in case of fulfilling these core objectives. They are usually stated in the form of basic principles of foreign policy and become articles of faith that a society accepts uncritically. These objectives include:

1. **National security** –It is the primary goal of a foreign policy. The concept of national security is not confined to territorial integrity or security of national borders. It may include the security of cultural and political institutions and beliefs and values. States also have the

primary objective of maintaining their political independence i.e. the ability to play their prestigious role in the international arena at their own will.

- 2. Economic Development-** The promotion of economic interests of a nation is the fundamental goal in foreign policy as it is directly associated with state's existence. Contemporarily, national interests are more economic than political and foreign policy is more guided by economic factors than political ones.

1.4.2. Middle-Range Objectives

The middle range objectives are sought to be achieved within a specific time period, implying that after the expiration of the term, the objectives even if attained would have lost their real value. Here the targets are more than one or two states. A state has to carry out trade with a number of states and trade blocks. It has to deal with multiple sources while pursuing these objectives. The middle range objectives include:

- 1. Non-Political Cooperation-**In the field of international relations mutual cooperation is more than necessary today. So the objectives of a foreign policy inevitably include economic, cultural and social cooperation. It is usually the keen desire of each state to establish, strengthen and widen its economic ties with other states. Status and prestige of a state can be secured only if the state is economically stable and prosperous. In the process, the state has to diversify its trade and economy in order to make it resilient enough to come up to the challenges of the competitive world. It has to export its goods, commodities and raw material to more than one destinations/states; it has to strengthen its export base in more than one commodity or good, so that no state, MNC, or group could exploit its vulnerability in this regard.
- 2. Promotion of National Prestige** – This includes those policies of states which are meant to develop an impressive image on the states abroad. In the past, this was done primarily through diplomatic ceremonial and displays of military capabilities. However, in today's world, prestige is increasingly measured by levels of industrial development and scientific and technological skills. Industrialized countries and major powers can increase their international prestige through a number of policies and actions, including expansion of military capabilities, distribution of foreign aid, diplomatic ceremonies, industrial and

scientific exhibition, and particularly through development of nuclear weapons and the capacity to explore outer space.

3. Territorial Expansion- The policy of territorial expansion includes imperialism and colonialism which the states adhere to meet their economic and political aspirations. From 18th to 20th century the European States had adopted the policy of imperialism to capture the markets, raw materials and to claim superiority in European affairs. Territorial expansion becomes an end in itself, whether or not it fulfills any strategic, economic or social needs. Others do not occupy foreign territory but seek advantages, including access to raw materials, markets and trade routes, which they cannot achieve through ordinary trade or diplomacy.

In modern times, the traditional imperialist policy has undergone a change and this can be explained by illustrating its two prevalent forms. The first is a policy which aims at the increase of areas of influence or ideology, such as the Russian policy of imperialism. The second is a policy that seeks to capture the economic resources by reducing the other state to the status of dependency, such as the economic/dollar imperialism of the USA and the Western European Countries.

1.4.3. Universal Long-Range Objectives

These are objectives aiming at restructuring the international system. Unlike, the primary and middle range goals, the long range goals are the ambitions which the states may achieve in distant future and/or the states never press them too much in the present. These distant goals of foreign policy are the plans and dreams of a state which an ideology forms to establish the international system of its own liking. They have no time restrictions, as time limit is usually employed in pursuit of core and middle range objectives. Long Range Objective are not only time consuming, but are also indefinite and vague i.e. nothing can be ascertained regarding the outcome of the pursuit, so they are unpredictable as well.

After the Communist Revolution of 1917 the Russian communist leaders, Lenin and Stalin reiterated that they would endeavour to expand communist ideology through every nook and corner of the Globe, as to them the capitalist system was defective and exploitative in its very nature. It was the Long Range Objective of Communist Russia, because by doing so they did not set any time limit for the realization of these objectives. Similarly, dissemination of capitalist

economy and democracy is one of the long range objectives of the US policy. After the end of cold war, it was believed that there is no serious rival to the Western Democracy.

Accordingly, in the book - “End of History and the Last Man” that was published in 1992, Fukuyama argued the controversial thesis that the end of cold war signals the end of the progression of human history:

“What we are witnessing is not just the end of cold war, or a passing of a particular phase of post-war history, but the end of history as such; that is the endpoint of humankind’s ideological evolution and the universalization of Western Liberal Democracy as the final form of human government.”

1.5. Foreign Policy Orientations

Orientation refers to the general policies, strategies and obligations of a state. The foreign policy orientation of a state can only be understood by a continuous observation of the state’s moves in the field of international politics. There are three types of foreign policy orientation, namely, isolation, nonalignment, and coalition making and alliance construction.

1.5.1. Isolation

Isolationist orientation is often based on the assumption that the state can best gain security and independence by reducing transactions with other units in the system. The policy of isolation is not the policy of isolating oneself from the rest of the world; it only means to avoid the pitfalls of international interest. It is a strategy which aims at avoiding transactions that may be detrimental to the security, liberty and welfare of the nation.

States generally adopt the policy of isolation in view of their geographic and topographical characteristics, freedom of action, freedom from international complication and tension, and economic necessity. Logically, an isolationist orientation would be adopted or could succeed only in a system with a reasonably diffuse structure of power; where military, economic or ideological threats do not persist; and where other states are regularly shifting alliances.

1.5.2. Nonalignment

The term nonalignment is of post-1945 origin. It is an independent policy which does not associate itself with the so called communist and non-communist blocs. It is a policy of keeping out of alliances because the alliances and counter-alliances may breed tension and ultimately lead to disaster. Nonalignment may be explained by perception of external threat as well as by domestic economic and political variables. To be non-aligned is to maximize opportunities to meet domestic economic needs, while minimizing dependencies. In contemporary international politics, the policy of nonalignment is very popular with the newly independent states.

Successful strategies of non-alignment require many conditions including;

- favourable structure of power and influence in the system,
- national capacity to defend independence and territorial integrity against those who do not honour a neutral position,
- the benevolent attitude or indifference of the great powers,
- reasonable remoteness from the main centers of international conflicts, and
- reasonable amount of internal political stability.

1.5.3. Coalition Making and Alliance Construction

Governments that seek to construct permanent diplomatic coalitions or military alliances assume that they cannot achieve their objectives, defend their interests or deter perceived threats by mobilizing their own capabilities. Thus, they rely upon and make commitments to other states that face similar external problems or share similar objectives. The states with common problems and common enemies generally make diplomatic and military alliances. The diplomatic pacts are made to achieve economic and cultural interests while military alliances are purely for collective defense.

1.6. Instruments of Foreign Policy

The instruments of foreign policy generally refer to the means or mechanisms used by states in conducting their relation with other states. These instruments include: *diplomacy, economic instruments, military instruments* and *psychological instruments*.

1.6.1. Diplomacy

From all the means of conducting inter-state relations, diplomacy is of primary importance in international relations. Since diplomacy is the method of establishing the pre-conditions for permanent peace through accommodation, it is an important instrument of foreign policy. Diplomacy means the promotion of national interest by peaceful means. War occurs because of the failure of diplomacy to achieve its primary objectives. Diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives.

An intelligent diplomacy, with the intent of preserving peace, has the task to choose among the three appropriate means at the disposal of diplomacy. These means are *persuasion*, *compromise* and *threat of force*. No diplomacy relying upon the threat of force can claim to be both intelligent and peaceful. No diplomacy that would stake everything on persuasion and compromise deserves to be called intelligent. Thus, in order to be serve both the interests of his country and the interests of the peace, the diplomatic representative of a great power must at the same time use persuasion, hold out the advantages of a compromise, and impress the other side with the military strength of his country.

In any state, the machinery of diplomacy is made up of two components. First, there is the home government ministry called various names in many countries. For instance, in Ethiopia, it is called the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; in Britain, it is called the Foreign Office and in the U.S.A., it is called the Department of State. The Ministry is the basic organ responsible for the conduct of foreign policy. However, it should be noted that foreign policy does not emanate from the Ministry alone; rather, other ministries such as Defense, immigration, Internal Affairs etc. play key roles. The second is the numerous diplomatic missions abroad i.e. the embassies, high commissions and consulates. The diplomatic mission, which is the center of all diplomatic activities headed by an Ambassador, is responsible for the execution of foreign policy and its day-to-day conduct. It is also responsible for gathering necessary information about the country in which it is located and for supplying this information to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

1.6.2. Economic Instruments

This is an instrument that is widely employed as it is capable of being used in both peace and war, which means that it can be used symbolically as a double-edged sword. One unique feature of the economic instrument of foreign policy is its flexibility or maneuverability. It can be used almost simultaneously to reward one state and punish another. A state may be given preferential trade terms by another state in order to encourage friendship and support while other may be deliberately excluded from such suppliers of preferential treatments in order to create problems for their economy and domestic interest capable of altering the policies of states or in fact bringing about a change of government. The economic instrument is also useful in war situation as states at war known to engage in activities which are intended to undermine the economic capacities of their enemies and hence reduce the enemy's ability to fight back. Example is Iraq war, where each country targeted areas such as oil field and petroleum refinery tanks, was intended to undermine the economic base of military power.

The main economic instruments are trade, foreign aid and economic sanctions.

A. Trade: Trade is the most noticeable and the most widely used instrument of an economic nature. It is defined as the exchange of goods and services between foreign policy actors. The world today is an interdependent world in which hardly any nation can be said to be totally independent of others in respect to its national needs. The inter-dependence puts in the hands of state a major weapon with which they can manipulate other states to attain desired policy objectives. The normal processes of trade encourage friendship among states; hence, states are perpetually involved in promoting trade and sorting out motions arising from such exchanges. While trade policy was in the past a typically bilateral instrument, it has become increasingly multilateral in the recent years, with the creation of trade blocks such as the European Economic Community (now the European Union), and WTO.

B. Foreign Aid: It refers to the voluntary and intentioned transfer of resources, typically, although not always, from one State (donor) to another (recipient). Foreign Aid is in itself divided into different categories depending on the objective pursued by the use of the transferred resources and which include:

- ↳ **Humanitarian Aid** - to relieve human suffering during and after man-made or natural disasters, without tackling the original causes of the vulnerability;
- ↳ **Development Aid** - to contribute to the economic and social development of the recipient in the long term without necessarily alleviating immediate suffering; and
- ↳ **Military Aid** - dedicated to the strengthening of the military capabilities of the recipient.

However, foreign aid has been often used to support ideologically closed regimes which have then used that aid to repress their population or enter into aggressive militarist policies towards other States. Additionally, there has been widespread criticism as to the efficiency of aid to achieve its pursued objectives.

C. Economic Sanctions: Economic sanctions are a typically coercive measure intended by an actor of Foreign Policy (imposer, the sanctioning actor) to cause economic damage to another actor of Foreign Policy (target, the sanctioned actor) and thus force it to pursue a certain course of action. They may include tools such as embargoes, boycotts, freezing of funds and assets and other trade or economic restrictions and may be bilateral or multilateral.

The use of sanctions has been refined with the use of the so-called ‘smart’ sanctions, targeted at specific sectors of the economy or specific persons. The objective of these smart sanctions is to force compliance on the target without unnecessarily damaging the society as a whole, including those parts which may have nothing to do with the policies that the sanctions aim to prevent. The European Union follows sanctioning regimes imposed by the UN and complements them with further sanctions. It also imposes its own sanctioning regimes. The European Union has imposed sanctions, among others, on Iran, Syria, Ivory Coast, Congo, Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, etc.

1.6.3. Military Instruments

This involves the use of force, terrorist attack and military coercion in conducting foreign policy objective of states. The most important role of military instrument is that of providing a background of assurance and stability for diplomacy. This means that military power is a major accompaniment of diplomacy or the ability to attain policy objectives. Because of its violent

nature, it is often used as a last resort when, for instance, diplomacy and other mechanisms of achieving peaceful settlement of disputes failed. On the basis of whether or not military force is actually used, there are two types of military instruments:

- A. Military Pressure:** It is defined as the threat of use of military force by a foreign policy actor against another actor in order to achieve certain foreign policy objectives and without having to use actual military force. The use of military pressure has proved quite efficient in reaching foreign policy objectives, avoiding more damaging conflict and maintaining peace at large. It nevertheless entails high risks, such as that of escalating a conflict and ending up in a situation of actual warfare. Additionally, the use of military threat as a foreign policy instrument must infer indeed the possibility of actual warfare in order to be efficient.
- B. Warfare:** Whereas war has been classically considered as one of the main instruments of foreign policy, such position has gone under pressure in recent times. The use of war as an instrument of foreign policy intends to achieve foreign policy objectives by the coercion or the use of military force on other actors. War may be divided into conventional (open warfare with the use of conventional weapons), unconventional (covert warfare or with the use of non-conventional weapons, such as nuclear, biological or chemical) and asymmetric (where the parties in conflict differ greatly in their military capabilities).

Unlike other instruments, the use of war as a foreign policy instrument entails an enormous amount of risk and cost. Risks include the possibility of a military defeat which would render impossible the achievement of the pursued foreign policy objectives, compromises and even put the vital interests at stake. Another possible risk is the lack of public support for the war effort, ultimately leading to the demise of a government.

Under international law, war is a legitimate course of action, only if it is confined to self-defense (Article 51 of the UN Charter). This international law is aimed at the reduction of the human and economic costs of war.

1.6.4. Psychological Instruments

Psychological instrument refers to the various attempts and means by which governments influence the minds and emotions of people in other states. The psychological instruments are

used to appeal to people rather than to government. One of the most used psychological instruments is propaganda. Propaganda is a systemic method of influencing the minds and emotions of the people for a specific purpose. Propaganda refers to the manipulation and distortion of information in order to achieve one's interest and defeat the interest of an opponent. It is used to make favourable image of one self and unfavourable image of others. It is also used to persuade other to see things in one's way. This can be done through radio, film, pamphlets and other instruments for creating favorable image for a country's foreign policy objectives. Most states today, maintain external broadcasting services such as VOA and BBC external services.

Basically, there are two types of propaganda, namely; external and internal propaganda. ***External propaganda*** is one in which countries image could be projected badly or favourably outside the country and within the international realm. This is done with the intention of making such a country take a define course of action. ***Internal propaganda*** is done within a nation -state on issues that are domestic nature or an issue that deal with domestic policy and decisions.

1.7. Determinants of Foreign Policy

The determinants of a state's foreign policy can be divided into two broad categories, namely, ***internal factors*** and ***external factors***.

1.7.1. Internal Factors

The internal factors include: historical and cultural values, geography, the population and its structure, public-opinion, national capacity, the political organization, leadership, and ideology.

1. Historical and Cultural Values: The foreign policy of a nation is shaped and conditioned by history. The nation inherits a style and culture which in turn influences and decides the course of actions that the nation has to follow in its relation to other sovereign states. The influence of history can also be seen in the foreign policy formulated by the newly-independent states. Tradition is also a factor in the making of foreign policy. Foreign policy is a form of social action undertaken by men, a foreign minister is part of the social milieu in which he operates and he cannot disregard the basic values held in his society.

- 2. Geography:** Geography directly determines the national goals and aspirations and hence is one of the most potent factors influencing the formulation of the foreign policy. Geographical factors, like the size and the location of a country and its natural resources contributes to the power of the nation, which in turn shapes its foreign policy. Although geography was and remains to be an important factor in foreign policy yet in recent years, owing to scientific and technological advancement its importance is receding. However, it does not mean that geography has lost its importance altogether, it still plays a significant role. Soviet Union's historic concern about the East European countries is because of geography and the USA's deep involvement in South American States is again because of geographical proximity.
- 3. Population:** The human force constitutes another determinant of foreign policy. The strength of a nation depends upon the quality and quantity of its human factor. The enormous population of China enabled it to pursue a forceful foreign policy. If the resources of a country are not sufficient to meet the requirements of the large population, the latter may pose a serious challenge to the very existence of the state. But if there are sufficient resources to meet the requirements of a large population, then it certainly adds to the power of the state, as this may enable it to mould its foreign policy accordingly.
- 4. Public Opinion:** Public opinion shapes the foreign policy, provided it is clear and well-shaped. It could be significant factor only in developed states. In developing or underdeveloped states either it does not reflect on foreign policy issues or it is too naive to play a significant role. Studies of public attitudes conclude that the vast majority of people even in highly literate societies are unknowledgeable, uninterested and apathetic with regard to most issues of world affairs. Other studies suggest that government, university and private programmes that have sought to create wider public knowledge and appreciation of the complexities of international politics have seldom met with success. The strong opposition of the American public to the government's policy on Vietnam led Nixon to adopt a policy of gradual withdrawal of US forces from Vietnam.
- 5. National Capacity:** National capacity refers to the military strength/preparedness of the state, its technological advancement and modern means of communication. The economic

development and enlightened political institutions are also associated with the national capacity. National capacity is a significant factor that determines and implements foreign policy. In fact, the foreign policy of states is directly associated with their national capacity. If the state increases its national capacity, it will strive to achieve a status of distinction in international relations; if it decreases the state will have to compromise with its poor status. For example, at the end of Second World War Britain became a less powerful state in Europe as well as in the world. This change in national capacity has brought overwhelming diversions in British Foreign Policy.

- 6. The Political Organization:** The internal political structure of a country has an important impact upon the country's approach to international affairs, as is evident from a comparison of the decision-making processes in an absolute monarchy or a dictatorship on the one hand and in a parliamentary democracy on the other. A despotic government has greater power, through censorship and the promulgation of regulations, to prevent the expression of undesirable opinions than a free government does. Indeed, the distinguishing mark of a free government is the very freedom allowed the citizens to express their options on public policy, domestic or foreign. The quality of government depends upon a number of factors, such as support extended to it by the population, the organization of the government, the quality of persons serving the government, willingness of the government to take the aspirations of the general people into account, etc.
- 7. Leadership:** The government and the leadership play an important role in determining the role of their country, which it is going to play in the international field. In fact, it is government and leadership, which convert the potential power of a state into actual power. The quality of a government to a large extent depends upon the type of leadership available to it. Leaders like Hitler and Mussolini could easily disturb the forward and steady movement of the nation; they jeopardize international peace and security as well. Whereas leaders like George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Winston Churchill would serve the nation most efficiently and steer the nation's ship safely from the troubled waters to the safe shores.

8. Ideology: Ideology is the basis as well as the goal of foreign policy. The states establish their political and economic institutions on the basis of ideology and endeavour to translate those very principles in the sphere of foreign policy. The ideology prescribes for policy makers both national roles and an image of the future state in the world. It establishes the long-range goals of a state's external behaviour, to be promoted through diplomacy, propaganda, revolution or force. Its relevance to day-to-day problem solving and to the development of specific actions in concrete situations, however, may be only very slight. As is obvious, a particular ideology has a goal which the state strives to achieve in international relations. The ideological division of the world between Soviet bloc and American bloc has focused two types of foreign policies. One is communist oriented and the other non-communist. A sort of affinity can be traced among the states of identical ideologies while there is feeling of animosity among the states adhering to contradictory ideologies. This is the root cause of cold war and post war tensions.

1.7.2. External Factors

The external factors include international environment, international organizations, reaction of other states and world public opinion.

1. International Environment: The establishments of friendly and cooperative relations between nations are the aims of a sound foreign policy; the complexity of task arises from the very nature of international politics. The multiplicity of attitudes and their interactions apart the difficulty of conducting foreign policy arise from the fact that a state has no sure means of controlling the behaviour of other sovereign states. It can persuade, promise or deny economic and military aid, it can threaten another state with the use of force and, nevertheless, it cannot be certain the state will act in the way it desires. There is another source of difficulty. The world is continuously changing, new events and personalities create fresh foreign policy problems for all concerned. To select instances at random, the impact of the October Revolution of 1917, the rise of Communist Power in China in 1949, the rise of De Gaulle to power in France in the fifties and the emergence of new states in Asia and Africa since Foreign Ministers of the time. Yet it has been rightly said that there is both

continuity and change in the foreign policies of all states, for every nation also has its history and its traditions.

- 2. International Organizations:** The international organizations have started playing important role in foreign policy formulation. The states have to take a note of international law, treaties and contracts so that their violation may not jeopardize the policies. The Communist China, for a long time, showed utter disregard of these factors and consequently could not secure its due position in the field of international relations. Only after 1971 she recognized their importance and that move on the part of Communist China have introduced new dimensions in international politics.
- 3. Reactions of Other States:** The states have to take notice of the interests of other states while formulating their policies. They will never endeavour to pursue those interests which are totally opposed to the fundamental interests of other states. Hitler in 1939 committed a blunder when he refused to be guided by the British reactions and events ahead with his Polish invasion. The result is well known. Japan's failure in assessing American reactions in Pearl Harbour incident again brought disaster to Japanese policy which had intelligently avoided offending the USA up to that period.
- 4. World Public Opinion:** World public opinion is very dynamic element. Like a flicker of light it influences the foreign policies only too occasionally. Only if the domestic public opinion supports the world public opinion it becomes an important determinant of foreign policy. The establishment of democratic institutions, the increase in the standard of living, the scourge of First World War and expansion of education have made the world public opinion a significant factor in foreign policy. The States never dare pursue the interests contrary to world public opinion. At least they will pursue only those interests which are not opposed to world public opinion.

CHAPTER TWO

DIPLOMACY: THEORIES AND ANALYSIS

2.1. Theoretical Approaches to Diplomacy

While the study of diplomacy has a long and honourable tradition, it is only in recent years that diplomatic practice has started to receive the sort of detailed theoretical reflection that its importance deserves. Most scholars of diplomacy implicitly choose from a very narrow range of analytical frameworks drawn almost exclusively from the realist tradition in International Relations (IR). As a result, the orthodox study of diplomacy has been marked by a remarkably unified theoretical approach. There is a surprising ontological consensus about what diplomacy is, and who the diplomats are. This consensus arises from the dominant influence of rationalist thinking. The upshot of this dominance is that the range of the scholarship in the majority of studies of diplomacy tends to be limited to analysis of the international realm of sovereign states in the context of high politics.

In recent years, however, there have been significant conceptual shifts in the study of diplomacy and as a result the scholars of diplomacy are able to choose from a wider range of analytical approaches. The customary view of what the proper study of diplomacy entails is now contested by scholars who apply analytical strategies drawn from constructivist, postmodern and critical IR theory to draw attention to the necessity of understanding international relations and diplomacy beyond the state and the international state system. As a consequence, the study of diplomacy has stepped outside the narrow state-centric security nexus into a world of diplomacy that is more varied but also more difficult to specify. There is a growing body of work interested in diplomacy not simply as a foreign policy tool of states but as a means of connecting cultures, politics, economies, and societies. Thus, the theoretical views in the study of diplomacy can be broadly categorized into the orthodox and non-orthodox approaches.

2.1.1. The Orthodox Approaches

The realist core of orthodox approaches to diplomacy is undisputed and is clearly evident in a number of key features found in this prevailing approach. Most telling is the focus on the sovereign state as the primary unit of analysis in diplomacy such that the study of diplomacy is confined to the study of the process and content of inter-state relations; how states sovereign

states seek to engage with each other. Prevailing models of diplomacy focus almost exclusively on singular state to state relations.

The orthodoxy defines diplomacy as processes of communication, negotiation and information sharing among sovereign states. Diplomatic processes revolve around the activities of professional diplomats – that is, officials of foreign ministries and overseas missions. More common, especially in North American scholarship, is the narrower definition of diplomacy as a foreign policy tool of states; that is, diplomacy as statecraft. This more limited definition has led to a great deal of foreign policy analysis passing itself off as diplomatic studies, despite the fact that it rarely considers the processes of inter-state relations. Both definitions, however, share the view that diplomacy has an ordering role to play in the otherwise anarchic and unstable international system of states – a view that has theoretical roots in realism. Successful diplomacy, it is argued, creates a system of states. It constructs balances of power, facilitates hegemonic structures and fashions post-hegemonic regimes. When diplomacy fails or is absent, conflict and war usually follow. Indeed, it is the very fact of conflict between states (a core realist assumption) that warrants the emergence of diplomatic systems.

2.1.2. Non-orthodox Approaches

Non-orthodox approaches are analytically diverse yet they share a key point of departure from orthodox approaches - a refusal to accept the state as the exclusive unit of diplomatic analysis. Diplomacy is seen as a more open-ended process where diplomatic agency includes the state but also a range of non-state actors such that a sociological concept of diplomacy emerges where diplomacy possesses economic, cultural, social as well as political forms and functions. A common theme within these approaches is, therefore the problematic core idea of the foreign ministry and its overseas missions as the sole agent of diplomacy.

Non-orthodox approaches suggest that the proper terrain of the study of diplomacy includes, but extends beyond, foreign ministries, overseas missions and the state officials that work in these government institutions and international organizations to potentially include diplomatic networks potentially drawn from all sections of domestic and international society covering any number of issues from the environment and e-commerce to avian flu and landmines. An important implication of this is that diplomacy has many modes including conventional inter-

state relations, non-conventional intercultural relations or commercial relations, and modes which mix the two.

Moreover, the study of diplomacy entails the rejection of the simple reproduction of the status quo of inter-state power relations (described as anti-diplomacy) at the heart of orthodox studies of diplomacy and, in the case of postmodern approaches, the production of the concept of “otherness” which, it is claimed, is the core of all diplomatic modes. In this sense, the world of diplomacy is characterized not by the commonality of the material and security interests of states but by difference – different interests, diverse cultures and varied identities.

In sum, non-orthodox approaches to diplomacy do not always tie diplomatic practice to the state, nor to the problem of anarchy. Instead, diplomacy is seen as a means of connecting individuals, groups, societies, economies and states to build and manage social relations in domestic and systemic environments. By moving beyond traditional realism, non-orthodox approaches to the study of diplomacy have promoted greater theoretical reflection and created an intellectual multiplicity in the analysis of diplomatic practices, modes and processes. It is to these practices, modes and processes that we now turn.

2.2. The Practice of Diplomacy

After centuries of customary and legal developments, widely accepted diplomatic practices were set down in the *Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations* of 1961. The convention is adopted by the UN conference in April 1961 and entered in to force in April 1964. It is one of the most ratified multilateral treaties signed by 149 states in 1986. The main principles underlying the convention include:

- Recognition of the status of diplomatic agents;
- The principle of the sovereign equality of states;
- Concern for the maintenance of international peace and security;
- The promotion of friendly relations among nations, irrespective of their differing constitutional and social systems; and
- Diplomatic privileges and immunities to ensure the efficient performance of the functions of diplomatic missions representing the states. Diplomatic immunity is a fundamental rule of international law that allows a diplomat to engage in international diplomacy

without fear or interference. It is broad enough to protect the diplomat from the normal law enforcement and civil suits of the host state. Diplomatic staffs also enjoy the same immunity the ambassador does, and the immunity extends to the attaches and the spouses and families of the diplomats.

2.2.1. Establishment of Diplomatic Relations

Under international law, there are no rights and duties of establishing diplomatic relations. The establishment of diplomatic relations takes place through the mutual consent of the concerned parties. States usually establish diplomatic relations through three general patterns:

- 1. Exchange of permanent diplomatic missions between states**— such as opening of embassies or consular offices and assignment of ambassadors and other diplomatic crews. The appointment of diplomatic agents is a constitutional act of a state. It can appoint any person to a diplomatic post in a foreign country. On the other hand, appointed agents must enjoy the confidence of the host state. The receiving state may decide on the unsuitability of a diplomatic agent, for any reason and may refuse to accept him/her. So before diplomatic agents are appointed, it is customary to ascertain whether the person about to be chosen is acceptable to the receiving state. A diplomatic representative therefore, is appointed only after his approval by the proper authorities of the receiving state.
- 2. Permanent diplomatic representation to international organizations**—For instance, Ethiopia might have permanent representative to UN in New York.
- 3. Ad hoc or special missions** – Such missions may include the head of state or government or even other individual ministries. Officials may go to another state on a state mission to discuss on certain timely matters or to forge further link in many areas.

2.2.2. Functions of Diplomacy/Diplomats

There are three main functions of diplomacy – *intelligence gathering, image management, and policy implementation.*

- 1. Intelligence Gathering:** An embassy gathers information on the thinking of the local political leadership, the state of the local economy, the nature of the political opposition – all of it critical for predicting internal problems and anticipating changes in foreign policy. Diplomatic representatives are the ‘eyes and ears’ of their government; their cables and reports form part of the raw material from which foreign policy is developed.
- 2. Image Management:** Diplomacy also aims at creating a favourable image of the state. Modern communication makes it possible to shape perceptions and attitudes around the globe. States today have vast public relations apparatuses whose purpose is to place their actions and policies in a favourable light. Foreign embassies supply local news media with official interpretations and try to avoid negative publicity or explain it away.
- 3. Policy Implementation:** Diplomats also administer the overseas programmes of the state. They negotiate military basing rights, facilitate foreign investment and trade, supervise the distribution of economic aid, and provide information and technical assistance. Diplomacy takes place in both bilateral and multilateral contexts. Bilateral diplomacy is the term used for communication between two States, while multilateral diplomacy involves contacts between several States often within the institutionalised setting of an international organisation.

2.2.3. Some Selected Types of Diplomacy

- 1. Bilateral Diplomacy:** It is the classical/oldest form of diplomacy which refers to the communications between two relatively independent states through exchange of envoys, messengers and other government officials. Currently, such relations may extend from mere political nature to the promotion of socio-cultural linkages between the governments and peoples of two states.
- 2. Multilateral Diplomacy:** It refers to the dialogues and negotiations attended by three or more states. Multilateral diplomacy allows all concerned parties to meet together, thus facilitating problem solving and agreement. Multilateral diplomacy has now become established and diverse feature of modern diplomacy, conducted through global institutions, permanent conferences and a variety of regional and sub-regional institutions. International institutions provide a global arena for states and other actors in which participation

demonstrates their sovereign equality masking disparities in terms of the real economic and political power that they hold.

- 3. Summit Diplomacy:** This is diplomatic communication at the level of heads of governments and/or heads of states. A summit is a high level meeting and exchange of views by the heads of governments/states, usually with considerable media exposure, tight security and a prearranged agenda. The heads of governments/states who visit several countries on a foreign tour usually engage in this kind of activity. Summit diplomacy can be carried out at both bilateral and multilateral levels of diplomacy.
- 4. Shuttle diplomacy:** It refers to negotiations especially between nations carried on by an intermediary who shuttles back and forth between the disputants. It is also an activity in which a person travels back and forth between two countries and talks to their leaders in order to bring about the agreement, prevent war, etc. Shuttle diplomacy is the movement of diplomats between countries whose leaders refuse to talk directly to each other, in order to try to settle the argument between them. In other words, it refers to negotiations in which a mediator travels between two warring parties who are unwilling to negotiate directly.
- 5. Public diplomacy:** Modern international relations are increasingly conducted through public diplomacy. Public diplomacy is different from the traditional mode of government-to-government communication. Instead, public diplomacy involves the more modern practice of trying to influence a wider audience, including public opinion in another country or throughout the world. It refers to a process of creating an overall international public image that enhances the state's ability to achieve diplomatic success. Public diplomacy is about building relationships with the people of other countries through understanding their needs and cultures; communicating one's points of view; correcting misperceptions; and looking for areas of common cause.
- 6. Economic Diplomacy:** The increased importance of international commerce has its inevitable impact on diplomacy and diplomatic practices. In the present world, economic aspects of diplomacy such as trade, finance and foreign aid have assumed greater importance and they may now be regarded as an integral part of diplomacy. Thus, economic diplomacy refers to diplomatic relations among states and non-state actors that are directed towards

achieving their international economic objectives and interests. It is about the creation and distribution of the economic benefits from international economic relations. Economic diplomacy is concerned with the process of decision-making and negotiation on policies and issues relating to international economic relations. It encompasses the decision-making and negotiation in international bodies, which may be multilateral (such as WTO), regional (like EU), or bilateral (between two states). Economic diplomacy facilitates trade and investment by establishing the framework of rules and disciplines within which markets and such commercial diplomacy functions.

7. Cultural Diplomacy: Culture comprises the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts but also mode of life, the fundamental rights of human beings, value systems, traditions and beliefs. Arts and culture are gifts of civilization rather than messages of politics, artists and philosophers are not political ambassadors. However cultural dialogues among states essentially help to build language of communication and initiate a link among based on their own free will. This is the essence of all diplomacy in the battle for men's and women's minds. Cultural diplomacy, diplomacy through cultural presence is expressed through exchange of program/cultural agreements, covering fields like science and technology. The standard delivery system of cultural diplomacy includes;

- Holding occasionally cultural fairs and festivals
- Supporting tours of own artists teaching own language to foreign public, showing music, films, cultural relics etc...to the foreign public
- Providing scholarship opportunities to citizens in other countries
- Sending professionals and technical experts to support other countries
- Teaching own language to foreign public

2.2.4. The Rules of Effective Diplomacy

There is no set formula that will ensure diplomatic victory. There are, however, some basic rules that affect the chances of achieving effective diplomacy.

- 1. Be realistic:** It is important to have goals that match your ability to achieve them.
- 2. Be careful about what you say:** Experienced diplomat plans out and weighs words carefully.

3. ***Seek common ground:*** Disputes begin but negotiations find common ground to end them successfully. Almost any negotiation will involve some concessions, so it is important to maintain a degree of flexibility. Most diplomats counsel that it is important to distinguish your central from your peripheral values. Intransigence over a minor point, when a concession can bring a counter concession on an issue important to you, is folly. There is some research indicating that concessions, even unilateral ones, are likely to engender positive responses. Other research concludes that finding common cause cannot end rivalry but can create cooperation.
4. ***Understand the other side:*** There are several aspects to understanding the other side. One is to appreciate an opponent's perspective even if you do not agree with it.
5. ***Be patient:*** It is also important to bide your time. Being overly anxious can lead to concessions that are unwise and may convey weakness to an opponent. As a corollary, it is poor practice to set deadlines, for yourself or others, unless you are in a very strong position or you do not really want an agreement.
6. ***Leave avenues of retreat open:*** It is axiomatic that even a rat will fight if trapped in a corner. The same is often true for countries. Call it honor, saving face, or prestige; it is important to leave yourself and your opponent a "way out".

CHAPTER THREE
ETHIOPIAN FOREIGN POLICY AND DIPLOMACY:
A HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

3.1. Ethiopia's Foreign Policy and Diplomacy in the Pre-1991 Period

The history of Ethiopia can be traced back to more than 3000 years. Since the ancient times, the state of Ethiopia had a long and fascinating history of contact with different peoples from across the seas. Throughout its long history, Ethiopia has been in many ways connected to the outside world. Trade and cultural interaction flourished with the countries of the Mediterranean basin as well as with those around the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden, the Indian sub-continent and possibly China. However, these contacts were for the most part transnational rather than interstate.

Modern Ethiopian state is understood to emerge in the mid-19th century with the reign of Emperor Tewodros II. From the very emergence of the modern state of Ethiopia, the country's leaders have been consumed with the twin concerns; establishing the legitimacy of the multi-ethnic polity as a viable nation-state, and maintaining its territorial integrity. The ultimate objectives have always been to have the world community recognize Ethiopia as a legitimate state and respect the geographic boundaries of the state. No matter what their ideological orientation or organizational form, the regimes of modern Ethiopia have complemented their domestic policies of control with foreign policies that relied heavily on strategic military and diplomatic alliances. Ethiopian leaders have advanced their causes through international diplomacy and defensive military actions.

Generally, in order to understand the changes and continuities in the foreign policy and diplomacy of the regimes of modern Ethiopia, it is necessary to place this discussion in a historical perspective.

3.1.1. Foreign Relations and Diplomacy of Emperor Tewodros II

Emperor Tewodros designed a foreign policy that would help him unify his domain and consolidate his power in relation to others. Throughout his reign, Tewodros tried to develop a dynamic foreign policy that reached out beyond the Horn of Africa region. He distinguished Christians and Muslims, i.e. he considered Christians as friends and Muslims as enemies. He

perceived the Turkish and Egyptians as the basic enemies and he wanted to have positive relationships with Russia, France and Britain because these countries are Christians. Sovereignty and reciprocity in diplomacy become fundamental principles of his foreign policy.

Tewodros attempted to have his regime recognized on an equal footing with the great powers of Europe. He appealed specifically to Britain, France, and Russia as fellow Christian nations to assist him in whatever ways possible in his fight against the Turks, Egyptians, and Islam. He also wanted these powers to keep produce local military weapons and wanted to be independent. His strong desire was not to import weapons but to produce locally. Regardless of his ambitions, Tewodros was not successful because Britain and France were not ready to help Tewodros in many respects.

3.1.2. Foreign Relations and Diplomacy of Emperor Yohannes IV

As a personality and as a ruler, Yohannes highly differed from Tewodros. He was more patient and less impulsive than his predecessor. Although both envisioned a united, Christian Ethiopia, their approaches were in contrast. Yohannes valued order more highly than the rigid centralization that had characterized Tewodros's rule.

Yohannes's most outstanding accomplishments were in the field of foreign policy. He pursued an active and cunning foreign policy similar to Tewodros II and even more acute than Tewodros. Whereas Tewodros had attempted brazenly to demand respect and the recognition of Ethiopia by European powers, Yohannes followed a course of prudent, practical and patient diplomacy. Yohannes concluded treaties and agreements externally with the British and Egyptians. The *Hewett Treaty* (1884) with Anglo-Egyptians was one of the eminent treaties concluded during his reign.

Yohannes faced strong external challenges from Mahdists and Italians. It was a period when Sudanese Mahdists challenged Ethiopia on its western border. It was also a time of heightened European interest in Africa as a base for colonial expansion.

Although Yohannes considered Islam a threat, he saw European expansionism as an even greater threat to Ethiopia's political survival. At one point, Yohannes even made an abortive attempt to form an alliance with the Mahdists against a potential European incursion.

When these countries were not ready to solve their differences peacefully with Yohannes, he conducted wars and won at the battle of Dogali, Saiti, Gundet and Gura. In 1889, the battle with Mahdists in Metema culminated his life.

3.1.3. Foreign Relations and Diplomacy of Emperor Menelik II

Menelik started conducting relations with the European powers especially the Italians when he was king of Shewa, Emperor Yohannes's serious competitor. In 1889, after the death of Yohannes, Menelik II and the Italians concluded the *Wuchale Treaty* in the small town of Wuchale, what is now Wollo Province. The treaty generally guaranteed a measure of security and trading privileges to both Ethiopia and Italy. However, Article XVII in the Italian version of the treaty, which essentially implied that Ethiopia was a protectorate of Italy, created disagreements between Menelik and the Italians. Menelik's diplomatic efforts to solve this problem failed and the battle of Adowa erupted in 1896. The Italians were resoundingly defeated at the battle with more than 35 percent of their troops being killed.

The Ethiopian victory at Adowa sent shock waves throughout Europe and caused the reigning Italian government to fall. For the first time, the European powers realized that Ethiopia was an African power to be reckoned with. Britain, France, Russia, and Italy flocked to Menelik's court in order to arrange the exchange of ambassadors and to conclude diplomatic agreements. Britain, France and Italy signed treaties with Menelik to demarcate the frontiers between their colonial possessions and Ethiopia. The treaties established Menelik's exclusive rights to the territories bordering the colonial possessions claimed by these powers. Even Sudanese Mahdists sought to stabilize relations with Ethiopia at this time. Thus, it was clear that the emperor was gifted with considerable diplomatic expertise, playing off one power against the other as pawns in an effort to secure the sovereignty of his country.

Furthermore, Menelik established modern institutions of administration after the battle of Adwa. In 1900, he established a council of ministers composed of nine ministries, including the Ministry of Commerce and Foreign Affairs, as an institution to execute the country's foreign relations. Ethiopia's foreign relations at that time were more of foreign trade and this might have influenced the emperor's decision of combining the two ministries together. Naggadras Haile

Giyorgis, a traditional person with no modern education, was appointed as the first Minister of Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

The main task of the ministry was to deal with guests, to talk with other states and ministers. Yet, it did not have the power to enter into agreement with its counterparts. The duties of the ministry were divided into four categories;

1. To talk about consular relations with other countries,
2. To talk about relations with other states and ministers,
3. To deliver passport to foreigners who live in Ethiopia, and
4. To translate books, newspapers and journals into Amharic.

The level of development of diplomacy during the reign of Menelik was limited due to lack of educated manpower and lack of understanding about the role of foreign policy. Ethiopia's Diplomatic representation abroad was limited during the time. Though the first and only consul was opened in Djibouti in 1897, there were neither permanent legations nor embassies established abroad. At that time, foreign relations were conducted through a delegation system of representations. Different delegations were sent to various countries to negotiate on various issues and to promote the country's national interest. For instance, a delegation led by Fitawurari Damtew Ketema was sent to Russia in 1895, presented Menelik's letter to the Czar of Russia and discussed on bilateral issues. Besides, there was no written foreign policy document that guide the country's relations with other countries. The Emperor made foreign policy decision in a pragmatic way according to the need of the time in consultation with close advisors. He followed "largely defensive and survivalist foreign policy".

Emperor Menelik II fell ill in 1906 and very soon he was totally incapacitated. His illness and the anticipated death alarmed a bitter struggle among different factions for succession domestically. The situation created internally soon affected relations with the powers ruling the adjacent territories. Britain, Italy and France agreed to cooperate in the event of Ethiopia's disintegration and possible territorial rearrangement in their own interests.

3.1.4. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of Emperor Haileselassie I

A. Pre-Italian Occupation Period

Menelik II died in 1913, it was not until 1930 that the next strong emperor, Haileselassie I, assumed the throne. Ethiopia's foreign relations began to take modern shape under Haileselassie I. It is during his period that permanent representations have begun and diplomatic missions were opened in many countries. He was dedicated to the creation of a stronger, more modern bureaucratic empire with unquestioned respect in the world community.

When he was the heir to the throne from 1917-1930, Teferi vastly utilized diplomacy for building his image abroad, and in related matters of prestige and foreign affairs. In 1923, Teferi engineered Ethiopia's entry into the League of Nations. He wrote to the League for reconsideration of Ethiopia's membership and after lots of deliberations, the country was admitted to membership, by unanimous vote at the General Assembly. Ethiopia's admission to the League had three advantages:

1. It helped Teferi to pursue energetically his policy of domestic reforms, raised his popularity nationally and internationally and increased his power base;
2. It exposed the country to world politics as peace loving and committed to collective security as a guiding foreign policy principle; and
3. At least in relative sense, it protected the country from colonization that could have been pursued by the neighbouring colonial powers.

Teferi also undertook a grand tour in 1924 accompanied by large retinue of noblemen, and visited Palestine, Egypt, France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Italy, England, Switzerland and Greece. Although he did not attain his objective of an outlet to the sea, he came back with his and the country's international stature increased and his commitment to introduce European way of administration strengthened.

Though Teferi was interested in European civilization, he was cautious of maintaining the traditional values intact. He reshuffled the ministerial system - he dismissed all ministers except the war minister, added new ministries and assigned a secretary general as his aid. Foreign advisers were recruited to organize the ministries and advise the appointees. This has enabled

him to run foreign relations personally and manipulate the benefits of foreign policy to his own ends.

Following his accession to the throne in October 1930, Emperor Haileselassie I began in earnest to lay the ground work for the development of a modern foreign service. In the 1931, Haileselassie I promulgated the first written constitution by which in Art. 14 he took into his hands all power of diplomacy and foreign policy. Furthermore, the decree that was published on Negarit Gazeta No.5 order 1/1935 stipulated the duties and powers of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. None of the Articles and Sub-articles provided the Ministry with real power to conduct foreign relations. The Ministry remained important but vested with residuary power to coordinate minor foreign activities such as financial and administrative issues with the consent of the Emperor.

Foreign policy was an important area where the Emperor was concerned to put his personal control. He went to the extent of controlling very minor activities. He regulated foreign activities by requiring entry visas for visitors, registration for commercial firms operating in Ethiopia, and the licensing of all lawyers appearing in the special court that handle cases between nationals and aliens. The Emperor was controlling not only the foreign relations of the ministry but also the routine management of day-to-day activities of the ministry.

B. Post-Liberation Period

In 1936, the fascist occupation of Ethiopia aborted the peaceful development of the country's foreign policy. However, the country's diplomacy continued as the patriotic war of the people continued within the country against the fascist force. The Emperor's continued diplomatic struggle in bilateral and multilateral forums coupled with the patriotic struggle waged by the people enabled the country to be liberated in 1941.

Following the liberation of the country, Ethiopia's foreign relations has expanded and started taking better shape. The organizational structure of the ministry has expanded and its duties increased. Many embassies, consulates, liaison offices and legations were opened in different countries. Nevertheless, the professional qualification as well as the number of workers with the necessary skill and knowledge were greatly lacking in contrast to the structure.

Though liberated from the shackles of fascism, Ethiopia remained under the protectorate of Britain not to pursue an independent foreign policy. The British government that allied with Ethiopia in the common struggle against fascist Italy dominated the aftermath of the country's political independence. British imperialism in Ethiopia completely controlled and embezzled the country's economic, financial and industrial resources. Britain totally controlled Ethiopia's import and export; the railway from Djibouti to Addis Ababa; and Ethiopian access to shipping.

Therefore, the priority of Haileselassie's foreign policy objective of the time was to guarantee the independence of the county and to oust the British out of the country. Haileselassie continued to elicit American interest in every aspect of Ethiopia's development. Gradually America's strategic interest in Ethiopia grew. On the other hand, Britain had to address its internal economic problems and social discontent that forced the labour government to give precedence to social security at home over the needs of imperial security abroad. It was not even in a position to cover the cost of the British Military Mission in Ethiopia (BMME). Hence, the British hegemony in Ethiopia came to an end in 1950 giving way to the ascendancy of Ethio-American relations.

In 1945, Haileselassie met with President Roosevelt of USA in Egypt. They discussed on the strategy of their future foreign policies. USA's foreign policy was mainly interested in the containment of communism in Europe and its possible expansion to Africa. Thus, Ethiopia was treated as a significant ally of US because of its proximity to the Middle East, Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Aden, the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. The Ethio-US relations were based on Ethiopia providing America with communication base - the issue of strategy. The Kagnew Station, a military base located in Eritrea served as a center for all US air and space operations. Since then, the US government showed greater interest in Ethiopia and continued to provide the government with increased economic and technical assistance.

The Emperor also had a keen interest to see a strong army of his own, and he wanted a strong military relation with the US to achieve his goal. In 1953, the two countries signed mutual defense agreement, which attached the US Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) to the Ethiopian Ministry of Defense. The MAAG heralded that the US took the responsibility to establish and strengthen the Ethiopia military establishment. The assistance enabled the Emperor to suppress the internal rebel groups.

The period from 1950s to 1960s was witnessed as a period where the Ethiopia's foreign policy was mainly targeted at gaining access to the sea and restoration of Eritrea. To achieve this goal, the government used the US as one of the world super powers to play the game on its behalf. The US played a determining role in the multilateral and bilateral forums in order to enable Ethiopia get Eritrea and have an access to the sea. The US tried to influence the General Assembly of the United Nations, it employed every possible means of diplomatic maneuver to satisfy the interest of Ethiopia in having Eritrea.

The amicable Ethio-US relations began to deteriorate in the 1960s due to the following reasons;

- ➔ With the development of satellite technology, Ethiopia's strategic importance to America began to be less important.
- ➔ USA's reluctance with regard to supporting Haileselassie on the conflict with Somalia because it feared that supporting Ethiopia means losing Somalia to the Soviet bloc.
- ➔ Ethiopia's visit to Moscow; in 1959, the Emperor was visiting Moscow for about two weeks and got some assistance and USSR pledged to construct the Assab refinery. This event was a headache for the US.
- ➔ The 1960 coup d'état attempt against Haileselassie that indicated the weakening of the Emperor.

C. Foreign Policy Principles of Emperor Haileselassie I

- 1. The principle of collective security:** was one of the first guiding principles of the Ethiopian foreign policy enunciated by Haileselassie at the League of Nations. Despite the unjust treatment of Ethiopia by the League of Nations during the fascist aggression, the Emperor remained ever loyal to the principle of collective security. He actively participated and supported the establishment and the collective security actions of the United Nations. Ethiopia was the only African country that sent troops and participated in the UN's collective security duties in Korea and Congo.
- 2. Peaceful co-existence with neighbors and peaceful resolution of international conflicts:** were also the guiding principles of Haileselassie's foreign policy.

- 3. Building strong defense capacity:** The Emperor had strong interest to maintain strong military power. He organized modern armed forces that were observed to be the best in Africa where the Ethiopians handled the maintenance of the military machines dominantly. He devoted about 20 percent of the country's budget for military modernization.
- 4. Non-alignment:** The basic objective of this principle was to diversify aid, and to change the country's image of being identified with the western world, in particular with the USA.
- 5. Pan-Africanism:** Ethiopia has been the "silent servant of the leaders of African liberation movement". The repeated victory of the Ethiopia over the colonial powers has boosted the moral of the colonized African people. Ethiopia not only served the African cause, it also overtly identified itself with the continent.

3.1.5. Foreign Policy and Diplomacy of the Dergue Regime

The reign of Emperor Haileselassie I came to an end in September 1974 by a military coup d'état. The military regime that took control of state power in 1974 adopted a foreign policy largely oriented to socialist ideology. The primary objectives of the foreign policy were survival of the regime and maintaining the territorial integrity of the country. Apart from these, restructuring the society along socialist lines was also considered as the foundation for the foreign policy motives at home. The major strategy to achieve the stated objectives heavily focused on building the military capability of the country. And force had been employed as the best strategy to silence dissent at home and deter the perceived external enemies of the country.

Since socialism was the guiding philosophy of the country, friendship and alliance with socialist countries of the world was considered as a viable strategy for realizing socialism at home and perhaps in the world. However, since the regime did not have the necessary economic and military capabilities to achieve its objectives, the country was very much dependent on economic and military aid on the others. In this regard, the country was heavily dependent on military aid on the Soviet Union which prevented it from securing any kind of military and technical assistance from the US and other European countries. The regime was condemned by the west for its human rights record, especially its treatment of former government officials. This resulted in declining Ethio-US relations marking its lowest point with the closure of the US military base

and operation of military assistance within 72 hours (Keller). Following such problems, internal and external enemies began to take action to hasten the demise of the regime.

Internally Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) launched military attack on the Ethiopian Army. Many external actors were involved in sponsoring the rebel group, including; Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Sudan, Somalia and later USA itself. Moreover, Somalia's invasion of the Ethiopian region of Ogaden was one of the serious external challenges of the Ethiopian Government at the time. The government did not have enough capacity to calm the Eritrean Rebels and the Somali irredentist invasion. However, the regime managed to reverse the Somali aggression with the help of the new powerful patron, USSR. The involvement of USSR in the region only heightened the superpower rivalry between the USA and USSR during the cold war era (Schwab).

The corner stone of Ethiopia's foreign policy at the time was maintaining continuing friendship with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Apart from the Dergue's near total dependence on the leaders in Moscow and their Warsaw Pact allies for military and logistical support during the war with Somalia and in the Eritrean conflict, several others factors have facilitated the consolidation of this new special relationship. These include: the immediate and unhesitant recognition of Mengistu's government by the Soviet Union; the quick and generous support they offered when the military regime needed assistance and guidance to address problems inherited from the past and related to the new socio-economic and political order.

Indicative of the magnitude of its foreign relations, the Dergue has signed numerous economic, social, political, trade, cultural, educational, consular, and administrative agreements and protocols with almost all socialist countries. The Soviet Union and its allies were thus able to exert immense influence in both domestic and foreign affairs of Ethiopia. Experts from the German Democratic Republic assisted the military regime in its struggle against domestic guerilla movements and external opponents, and in training cadres for the completely reorganized security services, later consolidated in to a full-fledged ministry with the biggest budget in the country. The Dergue had sent hundreds of Ethiopians for training to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Cuba while employing many of their administrators and technicians.

Apart from socialism, Ethiopia's strategic locations and other questions, such as; Eritrea, Somalia, and the issue of the Nile, had also shaped the foreign policy orientation and behavior of

military government. Ethiopia being located in the Horn of Africa is at the cross roads to the oil rich middle East region and Indian Ocean. As a result of this the U.S.S.R was keen to have stronghold over the area, replacing the United States. U.S.S.R came at the right time when the Dergue called for military aid to reverse the aggression from Somalia in the East and quell the Eritrean nationalists in the north part of the country. It should be noted that U.S.S.R was used to be a friend of Somalia, yet all of a sudden, it made a swift change of policy when it came to Ethiopian side; while the U.S.A piped in to Somalia. That was a time of cold war whereby the two super powers, U.S.S.R and U.S.A were pitting each other to have a sphere of influence in the region.

Ethiopia shares the Nile and its longest border with Sudan, yet the relation between the two had been strained for decades. Sudan was one of the host countries for Ethiopian opposition forces. In turn Ethiopia had been supporting the dissent groups in southern Sudan, including the Sudan's People's Liberation Army/SPLA (Amare Tekle). Amare argues that Ethiopia's foreign policy towards Sudan was based in part on the mistrust of the Arab Northerners as well. Similarly Amare contends that, "Ethiopia's relation with any third state in the Nile Valley have been shaped as much by Egypt's attitude and action as regards to Somalia, Eritrea and the Sudan and by its close association with Arab and Muslim States".

With regard to Africa's broader issues of decolonization and anti-Apartheid struggle, Ethiopia played significant role. The regime had extended its military and technical support to Freedom fighters in Angola and Rhodesia. The regime had also showed its solidarity to Palestine's cause by condemning Israel and sought political allegiance with the Arab world, however the negative perception that most Arab countries have towards Ethiopia remained unchanged. Finally, the regime collapsed following the end of cold war unable to survive in the absence of military aid from the socialist blocs, USSR, Cuba.

In general the adoption of socialism and its subsequent impact on the foreign policy of the country could be considered as a departure from its predecessors; however the policy objective of the country remained unchanged. The country's policy towards its neighbors, the region, and the Arab world remained unchanged. Such continuity of in the era of dynamic world teaches us the determining role of geography in the making and implementation of foreign policy of

Ethiopia. The issue of Nile River, boundary issues, the strategic location of the country, unique culture (Christianity) amid the Islam religion and Arab culture had cumulative effect in shaping the foreign policy the country

3.2. Ethiopian Foreign Policy and Diplomacy Since 1991

In May 1991, the Dergue regime was overthrown and replaced by the Ethiopian Peoples' Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) government. During this time, various changes occurred both internally in Ethiopia and externally at the global level.

1. Domestic changes - there were political, economic and social changes in the country.

- A. At the political level:* There was an ideological change in association with global political changes. Socialism ceased to be a state ideology and the most important institutions of the Dergue regime such as the Worker Party of Ethiopia and the National Shengo were dismantled. Ethiopia transformed from one party system to multi-party system. The centralized and unitary form of state structure also changed to decentralized and federal one.
- B. Economically:* The market economy philosophy replaced the command economy of the previous régime. Liberalization and privatization are adopted as economic policies of the new regime.
- C. Socially:* The class-based analysis of social relations during the Dergue period changed with the coming to power of EPRDF. Instead of classes, ethnic lines for analysis of social relations become dominant. This becomes prevalent with the regimes recognition of Eritrea's self-determination.

2. External changes

- A. The promotion of the Western ideologies:* With the end of the Cold War in 1991, the New World Order emerged, manifested by the west's promotion of the ideas of democracy, free market economy and human rights particularly in the Third World. The policy of containing communism was replaced by supporting democratization,

peaceful ways of conflict resolution and fight against terrorism as important policy of the Third World.

B. The promotion of international institutions: The west also raised the role of international institutions such as the UN, World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in the New World Order. They are given significant role in the international relations and also affected the foreign policy of Third World Countries.

The EPRDF government had to respond to the domestic and international changes to stay in power. The democratization process of the new regime was unique in the sense that it is ethnic based. The neighboring countries, for fear that it would have some implications for their domestic politics did not accept ethnicization of politics. Thus, the foreign policy concerns of EPRDF right up on coming to power were:

- a) peace and security at the domestic scene and sub-regional levels particularly with the neighboring countries; and
- b) the need to change the attitudes of neighbors towards the new policy measures taken by EPRDF. Accordingly, the regime pursued the following diplomatic measures to change the attitude of neighboring countries:
 - ↳ Invitation of state leaders to visit Addis Ababa and reciprocating them. A good instance was that Sudan visited Ethiopia perhaps the first to visit Ethiopia after the downfall of the military regime.
 - ↳ Signing of treaties of friendship and cooperation with neighboring countries
 - ↳ Abolition of visa requirement for nationals of the neighboring countries. This was done to restore the positive image of the Ethiopian state
 - ↳ Stopping supporting the insurgencies of neighboring countries. This means the regime was attempting to show the gesture of not interfering and destabilizing the neighboring countries.
- c) The issue of Eritrea was also the foreign policy concern of EPRDF. The issue of Eritrea was not only the issue of Ethiopians but also for African diplomacy. Eritrea's departure from Ethiopia was not in line with the OAU Charter for the Charter declares that boundaries are not subject to changes in accord with the Cairo declaration.

Furthermore, the positive relation that existed between Eastern and Southern African countries with the previous military regime created another challenge to the EPRDF government. Therefore, the new regime was endeavoring to make its relation good with these countries especially with Zimbabwe. West Africa region especially Nigeria which is very vocal in the region also presented a challenge for the government. It was believed that the policy of the new regime was dissatisfying the policy makers of Nigeria because of the ongoing internal problem with the Biafra Secessionist Movement. Thus, changing the attitude of Nigerian policy makers was one of the tasks of the regime.

Generally, the post-1991 Ethiopian foreign policy has been characterized by active involvement in various African affairs such as the African common market, the OAU/AU conflict prevention and management mechanisms, the African peace keeping issues, the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa, and the issues in the Horn of Africa. The foreign policy has also been characterized by the effort to diversify the country's foreign relation partners. The EPRDF's foreign policy identified both western as well as non-western powers as Ethiopia's external relation partners. It provided special attention to the particular significance of the rising powers in accelerating the country's socio-economic and political development.

The FDRE constitution in its Article 89 puts the followings as guiding principles to the country's foreign policy. These are:

- ☞ Promoting values of mutual respect for national sovereignty and equality of states and non- interference in the internal affairs of other states.
- ☞ Observing international agreements which ensure respect for the country's sovereignty and hence are not contrary to the interests of its people
- ☞ Forging and promoting an ever-growing economic union and fraternal relations of peoples with in Ethiopia's neighbors and other African countries.
- ☞ Seeking for and supporting to peaceful solutions to international disputes... etc

In line with the above said principles, the FDRE government has issued a new foreign policy document in 2002. It was in November 2002 that the foreign and security policy, which is now under implementation, was adopted by the government. The document thus identifies Ethiopia's foreign policy priorities as:

- Promoting relationships of peace and security with other countries
- Serving the economic development needs, economic policies and objectives of the country
- Defining realistic goals of development and democratization on the basis of the country's capacity to achieve.

Thus given, the Ethiopian foreign policy has an approach of what some call “*inside –out*”. Accordingly, the bases for the policy are: -

- ▶ ***Promoting development and building democratic system:*** this is to refer that the key interest of the Ethiopian people is eradicating poverty, diseases, and illiteracy. In other words, having accelerated development is not only a question of improving the living standards of the people but also of existence as a nation. Therefore, the government has already issued the development policy and strategy to achieve this. On the other hand, democracy is the key instrument to ensure citizen's rights, good governance that enables the people to have a peaceful life and focus on their development activities. It also ensures the peaceful co- existence of the diversified Ethiopian people. Hence, development and democratization are the basis of the foreign policy.
- ▶ ***National Pride:*** National pride is nowadays very much related to development and democracy. Ethiopians are proud of their civilization and the good things done by the previous generation. But the present generation is also humiliated due to poverty, backwardness, and lack of democracy and good governance. Ethiopians are now known as beggars due to the atrocious famine that claims thousands of life every year. What this in turn means is that the civilization and good things recorded by the previous generation, though we are proud of it, cannot rectify the humiliation of the present generation as Ethiopians are losing their national pride for the humiliation of poverty and backwardness which force them to look for help every year in saving the life of the people. Thus, from this perspective; national pride must be the base for the Ethiopian foreign policy.
- ▶ ***Globalization:*** The efforts that Ethiopia is making to bring about development, democracy and good governance cannot be separated from the regional and global situations. The world economy is highly influenced by the process of globalization. No country (poor or rich) can be free from the influence of globalization. Globalization, with both its opportunity and challenges, has become, a reality, whether we like it or not. Therefore, the foreign policy makes globalization the base for the country's

relation with other nations with the view to protect the damages and to make use of the opportunities of globalization.

Basing itself on all the above bases the newly adopted foreign policy is aimed at:

- ◆ Creating a conducive environment to make use of the available market and investment opportunities.
- ◆ Securing technical assistance, loans and aids for the development and democratization endeavor of the country.
- ◆ Enhancing friendship with countries to bring about conducive global and regional situation that contribute to our development, peace and democracy.
- ◆ Predicting the possible threats to peace and solve or minimize it through discussion and negotiation.
- ◆ Minimizing the negative impact of globalization on the country's development in collaboration with other nations and through individual and collective efforts.

Accordingly, the foreign and security policy established the following foreign policy strategies that should be employed:

- 1. Devoting the prime focus to activities at home:** The strategy based on the “domestic first, external second” approach, that focuses on what can be done in the country and to meet the need of its domestic requirements.
- 2. Strategy centered on the economy:** The country's relations of friendship or otherwise should be based first of all on economic matters. Accordingly, its diplomacy should be mainly centered on economic diplomatic activity. Also, the country's defense capability should not be built in a way that would have a detrimental influence on its economy.
- 3. Full utilization of benefits based on proper analysis:** We should be able to maximize what we can receive and utilize any assistance in the appropriate manner. Possible avenues of cooperation and access to them need to be thoroughly assessed and studied. It is important to know in detail the development cooperation policy of each country.

4. **Minimizing threats on the basis of proper analysis:** Strategies to forestall the threats of Ethiopia's national interests and security should be developed. It is necessary to carry out detailed and accurate studies as a first key step of a strategy to reduce threats and dangers.
5. **Reducing vulnerability to threats:** A strategy correctly identifying the sources of the country's vulnerability and then dealing with the problem should be employed. The principal sources of the country's vulnerability, i.e. poverty and political problems should be reduced.
6. **Building a reliable defense capability:** Strength in military power is a necessary pre-condition for deterrence, effective diplomatic action, and to acquire military victory with minimal damage. Therefore, it is proper that the institution of an intelligence capacity and the strengthening of defense capabilities must be the basic strategy.
7. **Building strong implementation capacity:**
 - A. *Forging national consensus* – The country's foreign and security policies, strategies, and relations should be made transparent to the public so that various sections of the community discuss these policies, improve on them and reach a common position.
 - B. *Strengthening the professional diplomatic capability* - Without professional staff functioning within an organization, policy implementation would not be satisfactory. It is essential that qualified professionals be deployed in an organized manner.
 - C. *Coordinating and involving those with a role in implementation* - The country's international endeavors, it also needs the participation of others concerned bodies.