

Past and Present, Eritrea's Leadership is to blame. Does Eritrea really learn?

Negarritt-Gazette 89E (NG89E) January 01 2005

"Eritrea needs us and we need Eritrea" (NG89E).

"The visibility of the invisibility in politics proclaims that there is no-hiding place for suzerains but the end of their political commodities" (NG89E).

"Nay giziyen bottan hitto de-a-ember zi-h-baaEs yel-lon"(NG89E).

Introduction:

NG89E was founded on February 15 2001. Its first version appeared on the internet on April 6 2002. The second version was published on December 28 2002. This is now its third version to publicise. Its motto is: *'free information to a free generation in a freed body and mind'* as well as *'ex cultu robur'* meaning *'strength through knowledge'*.

NG89E represents the voice of the 8 states and 9 ethnic communities in Eritrea. This makes 89 as its code of identification. One of its focuses is to expose Eritrea's current or past history of any kind of political, social, or cultural activities that had or had been performed but manipulated by an individual, an organisation, a government or a community. It functions as a 'watch dog' with a philosophical theory as its background principle. Its philosophical theory is that 'learning is building up and moving forward to make a difference'. Educationally, it adopts the principle of self-critical learning. Learning to a self-critical is one step forward. It recognises the concept of living in difference. It rejects suffering in silence for good reason – give and take information. To share its information with the people of Eritrea, for Eritrea is its ethical and moral obligation. It takes this as its prime task. NG89E declares to have no political affiliation to EPLF / PFDJ or ELF Parties. NG89E draws the line not to take sides but it firmly believes in unity of all Eritreans, for peace and justice under the practice of the right democracy.

It is the pleasure of NG89E to be here today and to have this opportunity to speak on a topic which it feels so passionately by taking the matter seriously. The issue of today's writing is about a political analysis focusing on the current different leadership personalities and different political parties emerged from the EPLF / PFDJ in Eritrea. The analysis is mainly centred on the nature of EPLF – DP / EDP based on a survey study of 486 Eritrean respondents in 10 months in 2003. These respondents are composed of Eritreans of both genders of different ages living in USA, Canada, Europe, Australia, Middle East and Africa, including Eritrea.

Political Analysis – The EPLF-DP / EDP

NG89E has welcomed the creation of the EPLF-DP as an opposition political party. Its welcome is based not only on its move and motive in taking a stand of opposition to the undemocratic rule of the Government of Eritrea (GoE), but because of the NG89E's principle of philosophical convection to believe and accept the practice of

freedom to establish a system of multi-parties in a democratic society as a bedrock to a nation's development.

NG89E uses its own observations to capture and measure events of current political phenomena. Whenever it assesses the delicate issue of politics in Eritrea, it does not rush to make a conclusive judgement or report. It encourages itself to deal with reservations because of what it observes, it needs time for reflection and verification of the observed action before advancing to report. Based on this, NG89E admits openly to have exalted the EPLF-DP's co-founder, leader and chairman General Mesfin Hagos (GMH). This took place as he appeared in Europe for the first time in 2001 as a political 'icon' of opposition. GMH is known to the Eritrean public as one of the signatories of the 'Open Letter' of the so called 'reformers'. These reformers were the high-ranking dissidents known as G15. 11 out of G15 are still in Eritrean custody of President Issaias Afewerki's (PIA's) in an unknown place, since September 18 2001. However, for unknown reasons, GMH has remained untouched being away from the trouble of his jailed comrades by enjoying freedom in Europe. The freedom in Europe is GMH's re-birth to mould the rest of his life with a new shape of mental development. But in practice, this does not seem to have occurred. The question to be raised is 'why is he in Europe'? Certainly, it is far too early to be judging. It is not easy to answer the question either. But, arguably, there is a grey area in Eritrean politics that is stifled between the GMN and the detained G-11 as well as between GMH and PIA. However, according to the NG98E's survey study of 10 months, most Eritreans (95.8%) believe the mystery is between GMH and PIA. The truth is yet to come. It is only a matter of time to reveal the dodgy affair which has already started to be palpated by our people.

However, retrospectively speaking and in the re-assessment of NG89E, that high praise given to GMH was for nothing. Such praise in erratum will remain only as an occasion for disappointment but certainly scar in the memory in history. At the same time it is also good to know why NG89E praised GMH so highly. This was because firstly, NG89E has a moral obligation to encourage GMH or any other politician individual who sides to our oppressed people. Secondly, NG89E respects, recognises and preserves the Eritrean cultural heritage of the meaning of an 'old age' of a person in our society. In a positive sense, an old age has a significant role to play. 'Becoming and being older' means to get priority in our tradition in many respects of decision making in the daily life of our people.

As a result, NG89E has been aware of the old age of GMH. It considers his old age uniquely as an era of a golden historical lifespan. The question to be asked is that why 'uniquely'? By way of example, NG89E attempts to describe the 'uniqueness of his lifespan'. Our societal tradition of oral history is partly based on a logical view and makes here an account to endorse the uniqueness. 'GMH, through his ups and downs in his life experience, is expected to have developed a better body and mind', as our ancestor's golden proverb says "***Sah-Erin leb-be'n enda-hadere yibek-kul***" (word by word it is said that '**grass and human heart grow and develop every night with the increase of age**'). In the light of this background, and by that time, NG89E took the personal and physical appearance of GMH into account as he began to tour in Europe and attend Eritrean public meetings of the diaspora. NG89E viewed this as a valuable political asset in the opposition camp and positive step of progress in a political road. By that time, GMH seemed committed to fight his own PFDJ but now

failing to show any transferability as the time rolls by. At this point, it should be noted that some Eritreans were already critical of GMH for his cloak-and-dagger behaviour. Today, in a political analysis, the critics have proved to vindicate the case that there is some truth with the cloak-and-dagger behaviour of GMH. For them (the critics), GMH's behaviour did not come as a surprise. GMH's politics is perceived and revealed today as an act of a smoking gun of a mushroom cloud shot by microwaves of artificial bullets. This issue of cloak-and-dagger behaviour will be treated later more clearly.

Putting the behaviour aside, NG89E goes back to address the point of the concern of old age. GMH was highly regarded as a veteran fighter in the Eritrean struggle for independence. Hence, it was expected that he would be an ambassador of truth, at least, ethically and politically. It was expected that he might contribute some positive aspects of winning and leading political strategies to the divided society of Eritrea. It was expected that his contribution might heal the old wound between ELF and EPLF / PFDJ. As a result, it was expected that our people might come to work in unity. All the hope put on the shoulders of GMH blurred away on one day like a wind on the desert or like a human shadow that can't be touched and controlled. All this ended up with the disappointment of our people. Without exaggeration, all the expectations blew away like chimney smoke from the minds and hearts of our people. Our people simply have earned disappointments from one event to the other since his presence in Europe and in particular as the speculations and observation surrounding GMH negatively grew as he was unable to show determination in addressing a clear political programme to fight the Asmara regime. His lack of credibility grows as he is and was unwilling to tell the truth to the public whenever he was asked in every meeting.

Moreover, the disappointment was clearly highlighted and realised as the members of the EPLF-DP came for a meeting from 20 to 22 February 2004 in Tuebingen, Germany. According to reliable sources, in the meeting, on the first introduction day, Ambassador Adhanom Ghebre-Mariam (AAG) declared his withdrawal from the EPLF-DP. Even though AAG decided to leave the party that he co-founded, he contributed his ideas to the Party in developing its future programme. In the debate, in summary, 1) AAG strongly opposed the current governmental inter-state boundaries (*Awrajjatat*) and that he suggested the re-instatement of the old geographical system in Eritrea. 2) AAG advocated for the study of the two available national languages in Eritrea and that a final decision could only be made by the people of Eritrea themselves. Third, AAG suggested the view of the length of time of a president to be four years and that the re-election should be maximum two times including the first election. Four, AAG contributed the benefits of the practice of executive, legislative and judiciary system in the Eritrean democracy. The debated programmes were finally approved by the party, even though GMH and his like tried to oppose to some of the passed motions, for example, changing the inter-sate boundaries (*Awarajatat*) to their status quo positions and the questions of national languages.

However, on top of the programmes debates, the meeting was dominated by the party's internal and external conflicts mainly between GMH and AAG. On the third day, AAG gave a full account of his withdrawal from the party. His speech brought to light that there were significant failures committed from the side of GMH and his allies that led to disarray of the co-founders due to lack of co-operation, collaboration, transparency, responsibilities and accountabilities. Such an open conflict in the

leadership of the EPLF-DP, brought anger, frustration and disappointment to many members and delegates of the party.

In a political analysis, such a conflict means to drive the political wheel of EPLF-DP backwards rather than forwards. On the other hand, such a conflict may bring forth a birth of new politics. From the viewpoint of AAG's addressed issues and explanations, there was a serious conspiracy theory against the Deputy Chairman of the EPLF-DP. This conspiracy theory caused destruction of the relationship within the leadership of EPLF-DP that was marred for a long time by many deteriorating and negative factors. As declared by AAG, one of the disturbing examples of the conspiracy theories was that when GMH made secret meetings with Ethiopian authority officials in Norway without the consultation of his deputy, AAG, on what issues to talk about and the nature of the plan before meeting any Ethiopian official.

The question to be raised here is that how could GMH do this to his Deputy? After all, he has been his comrade for decades but why then GMH kept secret? As long as GMH does not give a clear answer and explanation for his unilateral action, such action and behaviour can only be interpreted or perceived as a political plot or conspiracy theory. However, the fact remains that such inexcusable human failures in the politics of the EPLF-DP led to build an open bridge within itself. This open bridge of a political highway is currently in an un-negotiable position between the founders of the EPLF-DP who were once the old comrades in both the pre- and post independence of Eritrean. While so was the case of both disruption and construction at the heart of the three-day-meeting in Tuebingen, it was declared that the EPLF-DP was transformed into another party, called 'Eritrean Democratic Party' (EDP). Furthermore, the party nominated its new leaders but with more or less the same old personalities. For those who already know the Eritrean politics, the change of a party's name and the nomination of the same leaders could not come as surprise.

In an interpretative analysis, the change of name from EPLF-DP to EDP is nothing more than dressing the old gown and gloves. It could only be orchestrated and crowned by the old tricks and track record of the EPLF's outdated leadership tactics. Our people are well experienced with such behaviour of the EPLF. If that was not the case, AAG would not leave the EPLF-DP. No matter of what type of changes the EDP might make, the perception of our people towards EDP leadership will remain unchanged as long as GMH and his allies in the leadership remain unclean in every action of their approaches to their own people. For our people, the EPLF's oral and recorded histories are both evidence of a living bible for such unclean make-up of the EPLF's nature. Consequently, as stated above, besides his declaration to withdraw himself from the party, AAG announced clearly that he would fight the Asmara regime in his own way.

In the eyes of the NG89E, this is a bold and remarkable action of AAG. But such bold action has yet to be seen in practice whether AAG will stick to the guns of his words. Time will measure and prove the future achievements of AAG. However, in preliminary analysis, it is fair to witness that AAG can currently claim that he has achieved something GMH never managed. This is to say the goal-oriented struggle of AAG to establish either a united political party and/or political parties in partnership in Eritrea in less than a years time, is the reality of our time. In a comparative analysis of political development between AAG and GMH, there is nothing tangible so far that

GMH can offer to the Eritrean people. NG89E can equally stand on the side of GMH by the time, he invents 'a wonder or magic medicine' to Eritrea but in action and not words.

NG89E believes that political unionism must face up to the new realities in Eritrea. Further, NG89E believes that a peace process – any peace process – is enormously difficult. But with determination and a preparation to take risks and make compromises, a peace process can succeed. For this, South Africa can be a good example. But a peace process can also fail. Good example for this happening is the tragedy unfolding each day in Middle East, especially, Iraq, Palestine, Israel etc. Let us learn from these places of political turmoil.

However, what has come up, significantly, with this move, was the nature of the naked personality of GMH. This move has given an opportunity to examine, analyse and question GMH. To begin with, the basic questions are that: 1) What is wrong with GMH? 2) What makes him silent? 3) How long is his silence? 4) When is the time that he speaks out the truth? 5) When is the time that he tells us what he knows? This move may seem a new phenomenon of politics for those who do not know who GMH is or was.

In a political analysis, the move is about a stage of demonstration of a political arena in which GMH is hit back by self-exposure of plot in having a hidden agenda after two years of underground rehearsal in a closed circle. It seems to NG89E that GMH does not grasp that the majority of our people are no more credulous to accept everything as it was in the past. On the contrary, today, our people are becoming more and more critical and reflective. From the viewpoint of social sciences, it is the debate and questioning that sharpens the test of democratic taste of our peoples' mind. Weighing up all these factors and driving forces, NG89E is keenly determined to look at the EDP's leadership personalities. Therefore, NG89E makes the following account of GMH's *fait accompli* culture.

In the light of the above given background of explanations, there are considerable characteristics of GMH that prove him to disqualify himself from being a good leader and a good politician. Why is it so? The mega-bite- deep-store of his hidden agenda is now going to be operated one by one in the proceeding part of different issues.

Issue One: Silence v Exposure

NG89E, in all its efforts, articulates its words to make GMH aware of himself and his leadership. In its emphasis, NG89E says that ***human minds are like parachutes, and that they work best only when open.*** What does this statement mean? And how is it related to GMH? Its relationship is that the mind of GMH has the characteristics of either being totally closed or one-sided. It is one-sided when GMH makes a deal with his Master in Asmara to represent PIA to continue the legacy of dictatorship not only inside Eritrea but also outside Eritrea. Such behaviour is easily interpretable to describe GMH the type of '*Ende Rassie*', i.e. GMH is representing the GoE himself in the name of PIA. That is why, it is easily thinkable to those who are experienced politicians to see this way or come to the doubt of the availability of political conspiracy theory. This is not unexplainable. GMH is totally closed when he

does not open the door to share his heart with the other political parties and concerned individuals that consider themselves as representatives of the Eritrean people in the interest of Eritrea. This type of behaviour makes GMH distinct that he may not only be the '*Representative of PIA or PFDJ*' but perhaps another person by far worse than the PIA, when he does not learn anything from the past. At this point, it is notable to ask the question: Can the old age be a cause for the absence of self-reflection? Self-reflection means it is as just as looking yourself in a mirror to make adjustments that reflect realities. How did this happen to GMH that he is not self-reflective? But our forefathers were still self-reflective even when they try to defend themselves. For how long can a '*Berlin Wall*' behaviour continue? For how long is the dogmatic belief of 'no inclusion but exclusion' to continue? For how long can a political 'isolation' be in limbo? What is the consequence of being 'a Berlin Wall'? To elaborate on this, it is a scientific and logical argument to highlight the practical and factual problems associated with 'a parachute'. If the parachute does not open that means the one hanging on the parachute has little chance to survive. That is to say a death or a body injury is to be anticipated, resulting from a fall in an unknown area – ocean, lake, rock, forest etc. Hence, the risk of being not open is greater than its value. Such a risk in politics can be interpreted as a risk for self-death / self-murder / self-hanging, or self-isolation. Then why does GMH seek risks rather than safety. That is why people think of conspiracy theory that there is something a kind of political gamble with the Asmara regime.

What is the meaning of silence?

The other side of silence versus exposure is hiding valuable information from the people of Eritrea. This equates GMH in his behaviour to suggest that he is trying to prolong his existence of self-advantage and his Master's life to stay in authority. That means GMH is hiding all the present and past conspiracies and crimes of the inside-closed-circle life of the EPLF. Imagine how many Eritreans lost their lives since the inception of the EPLF for the legacy of PIA. Imagine how many Eritreans have become disabled mentally or physically or both. If GMH is unwilling to tell the truth of his personal experience of the inside-closed-circle life of the EPLF, then there is only one option to think about. This one option, is to think is that GMH is directly or indirectly but deliberately to be blamed for hiding the facts needed to be exposed to the Eritrean public. Surely, this is to opt with hindsight of the political interpretation that GMH is doing it for the purpose of cover up and of self-survival as well as of PIA as highlighted earlier.

As a result, NG89E strongly criticises GMH's failure to accept to say: 'I have learned a huge lesson. Now I have to stand up for what is right'. His insisting on divulging is as if someone is deliberately keeping his cards close to his chest for fear that his Master PIA will withdraw the title and authority of '*Ende Rassie*' as well as reject him from clinging to power after PIA.

All this will not help GMH if a thing is to be rectified. It is worth to think that every act that occurred in the Eritrean struggle for independence is important. It is the highest time to reflect and be critical to the self. GMH's life is a part of Eritrean history because it is and was a part of our people's life. Therefore, what is essentially needed, is the whiteness and purity of his heart in all dimensions. It is worth noting to

remember the words of the Italian sculptor and painter, *Michael Angelo*: 'Trifles make perfection, but perfection is no trifle'. In contrast, what is needed from GMH is clarity, candour, transparency, accountability and competence and not silence, conspiracy and hostility against each other or the ELF as a whole.

In light of the above arguments and explanations, one thing NG89E can't resist telling GMH is that to bear in mind that the clock is ticking against him with every step his foot lands at a different angle, which is rarely the kind of angle nature intended, and that every footfall could lead to a sprain, fracture or fall. This is an anatomical analysis that describes the political realities and possibilities in Eritrea today and in the past.

Now the time seems to be ripe so that politicians do the job squarely and efficiently. If GMH learns to welcome new experience, he will find he can cope with a wide variety of situations in new and helpful ways. But the fact is that GMH does not look to be. If he is to remain the driving force within his party or other Eritrean parties, first, he must prove a pill too bitter for him to swallow. This is that NG89E asks GMH to spell out the following events without any reservation:

A. How GMH feels today when he thinks or reflects back, just to mention a few examples, about:

1. The Eritrean civil war, i.e. killing each other between EPLF and ELF in 1960s – 1980s?
2. The documentary agreement between PIA and the CIA in Asmara, Decamere or Alla – Seled - Berazio in the 1960s - 1970s, perhaps even later?
3. The death of Abraham Tewolde in Alla, Egela-Hames, Akele-Guzai in 1960s?
4. The killing of Eritrean students, known as '*Deki Kebessa*' in the ELF in 1960s?
5. The killing and imprisoning of innocent fighters /*Tegaldeti*/ in 1970s – 1980s being called *Menka-E* members? Those dead ones came to the war field voluntarily to fight the Ethiopian Imperial Rule in order to fulfil their dreams of Eritrea's total independence and societal freedom, but unfortunately, they were labelled by the EPLF leadership as Extreme Leftists (*Huluf Tsegemawian*) and Extreme Rightists (*Huluf Yemanawian*). This was because of their demand to see the implementation of democracy in practice within the rule of the EPLF.
6. The death of Woldemichael Haile (Wedi Haile or Te-ame Haile) in 1977?
7. The death of Amanuel Flanssa (Wedi Keshi) in 1970s?
8. The death of Betsaiy Goitom Berhe in 1970s?
9. The death of Ibrahim Affa in 1980s?
10. The death of Solomon Woldemariam in 1980s?
11. The death of Issias Tewolde (Wodi Flanssa) in 1980s?
12. The death of Tesfa-Giorghis Georgo (Wedi Georgo), Addis Ababa, in 1990s?
13. The imprisonment of fighters after the event of demonstration that took place in Asmara football stadium in 1993?
14. The death of the physically handicapped fighters (*Akale Senkulan Tegadelti*) in *Mai-Habar* 1994?
15. The abuse of our females from Tegadelti and civilians since decades?

16. The execution of ca 150 Eritrean prisoners on June 18 and 19, 1997 in the outskirts of Asmara, around *Kushet*?
17. The imprisonment of close comrades, i.e. the Government Ministers, called the G-11, on September 18 2000?
18. The current death of the youth and adults in *Addi Abbetto* in November 2004. They were composed of civilians and *Tegadelti*?
19. and many more?

B. How would GMH describe the above deaths to the public: murder (as a first hand murder, or second hand murder) slaughter, friendly killing or shooting, natural death, etc.? And how would GMH justify the death of each individual?

C. Can GMH tell the Eritrean people about the selection criteria of squads in organising the process of *hujjum* wars in the past? Who made decisions on who should go to die (similar to euthanasia: involuntarily sentence to death)? Who was allowed to stay to serve the interest of the leaders within the EPLF? C1) Can GMH tell us today, whether those Eritrean fighters were, in reality, suicide bombers or not? C2) Did they give their consent when they were asked to do the job of '*hujjum*'? Were they voluntarily giving their names to go for '*hujjum*'? Or C3) were they forced to do so because a democratic right of questioning and answering was not an issue at all and that there were no criteria at all? Or C4) as the EPLF exploiting and commanding motto insists, '**do the job first and then ask, or face a military discipline**'. That means someone asks when he dies. Such a military exploiting measure was barbaric, unrealistic, impossible, immoral, unethical, and inhumane despicable and inexcusable act.

By the way, what is *hujjum*? *Hujjum* is originally an Arabic word. It may have a different meaning than this version. However, according the Eritrean EPLF military use, experience and perception of it, it means that a soldier fights the enemy in an open way by giving his / her life to be martyr. In its practice, it was a forced martyr and not voluntary because the soldier was chosen by the leader to act in such a manner to accomplish the military message with great probability of dying. If the chosen soldier did not accept the command of his / her leader, he / she should face a military action. Even today this behaviour is exercised in the battle field. The evidence is the recent border war with Ethiopia. The only difference to the past is that today an individual is not chosen but a unit or units ('*ganta*' in Tigrigna) as a whole. One '*ganta*' has three units. Each unit has 16-20 members. Three units make up one '*ganta*' of 40-60 members of fighters. One '*ganta*' from a company or battalion is chosen respectively, for every necessary occasion to be a martyr, for example, to clear away a mined area to create a loop or a passage for use to run away from or attack an enemy position. Such a circumstance, obviously, presents and demonstrates the occurrence of deliberate death with great probability.

D. Can GMH tell us about the land ownership system, the 'selling or buying criteria' and their processes in the Region of his past administration in which our people still blame his management in the South Zone of Eritrea?

E. Can GMH tell us about how the gender issue in Eritrea is thrown under the carpet when our females have become slavers of the male dominance culture within the authority positions of the *PFDJ*.

F. Can GMH tell us who was a real CIA agent in Eritrea?

G. Can GMH tell us who was preaching to the Eritrean people, saying we are fighting against Ethiopian rule and all other types of capitalism, imperialism of the Western World and Zionism of Israel?

H. Can GMH tell us about who was getting medical treatment in the care of the Israelites in the heartland of Israel?

I. Can GMH tell us of how many Eritreans were allegedly accused of being agents of Imperialism and Zionism, and then sentenced to death?

J. Can GMH tell us who have been the gamblers and alcoholics in the secret pubs of Asmara or other cities or towns in Eritrea at nights since 1991?

K. Can GMH tell us about the hidden agenda between the EPLF and TPLF in the 1980s and 1990s as well as between PIA and Ethiopia's PM Meles Zenawi in the 1990s?

L. Can GMH explain to our people, why *EPLF* or *PFDJ* works under the cover of the wrong unhealthy systematic operation of '*no-trust-culture*' throughout its life which has become the ultimate main cause to its self-destruction? Is *PFDJ* aware of this?

In conclusion, in the mind of NG89E, 'only the dead have seen the end of the war' and of the '*no-trust-culture*'. Analytically, this means that our people are not blessed to live peacefully. On the contrary, our people are sentenced to die in continuum to see the end of war not necessarily by the *God's Will* but by the human exploiting abuse of power in order to serve the one man's life, the Eritrean President including his handful of diehard followers.

Up and down the country, let us look at what is happening now. Some highways are no longer in control under the world of the Government of the odious tyrant, since there is no safety and security outside the capital. This is evident on the account of the state of emergency in certain areas outside the capital. The spirits and courage of our youth have melted away by forcibly locking them up in the front for fire and cold in the name of an *Army of National Defence* and in the name of the *National Service*. Development projects of the reconstruction of the nation have come to halt when people are not available to work with interest and full capacity. When the country's economy is hit and its fuel has become rationed, isn't this the sign of the GoE's corruption and collapse? Then how can a government run? When jailing people is on the daily agenda and when jail centres outnumber the healthcare staff and healthcare institutions, then how can a nation function? National education suffers under poor resources. How can education function when the educators and the learners are not there in the schools? How can education function when the youth and adults are hunted down from their homes for military purposes in continuum? No one understands the circumstances of our youth and adults when their minds are beset with the physical and psychological pressure, terror, intimidation of their own Government. Hence, there is no wonder when education is failing. The cost of daily life is painful when there is a big gap between supply and demand in the common

market. It is logic to say where there is no national income and where there is no national production and where there is no free market economy, it is not only a matter of the quality of living of the community to be questioned but also a matter of the end of life for the community. That is why many of our youths have fled their country to the neighbouring countries, such as the Sudan, Ethiopia, Djibouti, Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and fled further up to Kenya, Libya, Egypt and then to Malta and Italy to the Mediterranean Sea; from there again to the rest of the world. All this is to search for a place of better life, peace of body and mind, freedom of speech and press, dignity and respect of human rights, shelter and protection from the physical, psychological, mental and social stresses of the human labour exploitation in their homeland by their own governors. These governors (from the highest to the lowest level of the administration) seem not only to lack the faintest idea of how to bring peace to Eritrea, but they also seem not to understand the values – such as basic human rights – which our people hoped to bring to our country. Was this all that our people should have to deserve? Was this all the meaning of our martyrs those who gave their lives for the sake of their country, Eritrea and people of Eritrea? Was this all that our people voted in referendum for the total independence of Eritrea in 1993? Was this all what *EPLF / PFDJ* promised to do 1977, 1987, 1991, 1993, 1994 etc? All these are the realities and not illusions of our time. But there is one fact that remains and this is, as to the mind of NG89E, ‘only the dead have seen the end of the war’, as stated before. This means, these are our martyrs who are lying in peace beneath the earth. Their suffering is gone once and for all. But those who are alive are having a bitter agony that is not only once and for all but in continuity as long as they live on earth under the legacy of their bad governors. The question is how could have our people been so misled? Once, twice, trice etc?

Issue: GMH’s Nomination as EDP’s Chairman ???

History repeats itself. This is a typical *EPLF*’s behaviour of elections behind doors throughout its life. Who is to be nominated or elected is already decided not by the grass root members but by those who are political power seekers who are at the top level. Grass roots members can only act as tools and cover-ups. There are many examples of such unethical and undemocratic practices of incorrect procedures and rules in *Shabia / EPLF*. Precisely, this old trick was played down in the *EPLF-DP* Congress in Tuebingen, Germany. The incorrect rule is simple to explain. Things are organised and arranged in advance:

1. in how to nominate someone as a candidate;
2. who from the grass roots has a private voice (‘per pro’ means ‘through an agent’) to mention that candidate of the hidden agenda in the name of the majority;
3. or who from the already available leadership members can give his voice of support to nominate someone to ensure the representation of their interest.

In *EPLF*’s view, this design shows that it is a practice of an open democracy. In reality, this is a robbery of democracy. The grass roots have not an autonomous say but to accept the passed resolution. On the other hand, it is organised, how the would-be candidate to behave or react during the election process. This is to show disinterest in the candidacy, responsibility, management, leadership and ultimate power. This

may mean in the politics that someone who is a candidate may look innocent and disinterest in having power at all. In fact, the political bargain has already been made. In such agreement, the end goal of achieving power is already secured. This system has been working for decades in the EPLF and now witnessed in our modern time, especially in the heart of Europe. Members are faced with *a fait accompli rule* when decisions affecting them have been made. The following statements from a reliable source confirm what GMB said in his own words in Tuebingen during the nomination and election of the new EDP leadership:

“I will not seek political office and I will not accept the nomination of my party for another term as your Chairman because I am not physically fit for the demanding position” (GMH 20-22 February 2004 Tuebingen, Germany).

When some members insisted and some objected to the nomination, GMH said ***“I can only contribute as a member not as an officer”***.

The political drama did not stop there. His (GMH’s) colleague, Dr. Asefaw Tekeste took a position by raising his voice in support of GMH. Dr. Asefaw emphatically said ***“the Party can’t function without GMH”***.

As GMH heard such a pre-designed voice of support, it did not even take him (GMH) a fraction of a second to change his (GMH’s) mind. All the rhetoric of GMH was out of the window. Finally, GMH said, ***“If you insist I will accept the nomination”***.

As it was pre-organised, this enabled GMH to be a chairman of the EDP. Questions: If GMH really feels physically unfit, why did he accept it? How about mentally, is he really fit to lead a party? What made him change his mind in seconds as if he was not for nomination and election? Is this a sign of a positive mental health when GMH changed his mind in seconds? Where is GMH’s honesty? What is his relationship to Dr. Asefaw Tekeste in particular? What do they have in common? Why did Dr. Asefaw Tekeste show a special interest in GMH? Or is GMH a political tool for Dr. Asefaw’s unknown mission or ambition? Time will come to expose every one and question. Time will set the record straight for the sake of truth and the public.

Conclusion: In a political analysis, GMH’s election of chairmanship in Tuebingen was and is an act of conspiracy. This is to say his nomination was illegal, unethical and undemocratic process. This was and is the same as it was and is in the EPLF’s history, the current PFDJ’s administration, and in the PIA’s leadership style that does not allow transparency and accountability.

Issue Two: GMH’s Speech on August 22 2004

The other dilemma of GMH is his speech delivered on August 22 2004. In his speech, he made clear that he tries to represent the PIA by advocating the case of the boundary between Eritrea and Ethiopia. The point is that GMH still fails to address the bone of contention in Eritrea. The bone of contention has two main factors waiting for resolution. One is that internal and the other is external. The external is dependent on the internal factor. This means the internal factor is the internal problem in Eritrea.

The external factor is the external problem with Ethiopia and the rest of our neighbouring countries. The internal factor is multifaceted. On the one hand, the problem is between the Government and the people including the opposition parties and inside the Government within itself. On the other hand, it is among the different opposition groups. All these problems and factors affecting each other are the result of the GoE for not being able to lead a country and its people appropriately. GMH fails to mention the main problems and fails to criticize PIA openly. Any sustainable solution in Eritrea is dependent on the quality, ability and capacity of Eritrea's Government and its relation to its own people.

But the reality is that the GoE has proved to have neither quality, ability and capacity to govern nor has positive relationship to its own people. Where there is lack of governance, relationship, communication, co-ordination and co-operation, it means it is a downfall of a nation. When this is the case of our current problem which is not only imminent but visible and palpable, how on earth can GMH talk about the conflict on boundary with Ethiopia rather than to pinpoint and articulate the main problem of Eritrea that it has with its own Government and its own people. This must have a priority in finding a solution for it is a primary in its nature rather than to speak from the issue of boundary which is secondary by comparison.

The reason is simple to explain. The issue of boundary is a pure political game for both leaders in Eritrea and Ethiopia. Neither PIA nor PM Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia can change the decision that is signed by them in 2000, Algeria, Algeria.

However, both these leaders and signatories may try to intrigue their own peoples by creating internal and external conflicts in order to lengthen the time of their undemocratic rule now and then so that the two peoples of the two countries will not be able to live in peace and unity in their own homelands of separate entities. Peace in a nation and unity of people mean shortening the life of trouble makers who are corrupt politicians, rulers and administrators. Therefore, GMH has nothing to fear from Ethiopia but from his master, the PIA whose life is surrounded and baptised by the spirit of conflict, deception and crime from the time of his leadership in Barka, then in Sahel and now throughout Eritrea.

Therefore, the fact of the matter is that the issue of boundary is not in the hands of PIA or PM Meles Zenawi but it is in the hands of the Hague's Boundary Commission, UN, USA, EU, AU. These bodies are all together accountable to the decision made between Eritrea and Ethiopia. In other terms, the decision is in the hands of the world community. Therefore, the decision is a dead issue that can't be altered. That is why the decision is concluded and termed as '*final and binding*' and ones for all. This argument is precisely proved with the announcement of the Ethiopian Government on 25 November 2004 that the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission (EEBC) decision is wholly accepted and respected after Ethiopia's rebellion but in vain. The world community has spoken with one voice in support of Ethiopia's acceptance to the EEBC decision to start demarcation in a physical way. Now the ball is in the court of the GoE for the implementation of the demarcation process. However, Eritrea, regardless of Ethiopia's acceptance, has already rejected the Ethiopian positive response of the demarcation implementation. The question is that who is moving the carriage wheels from the back to the front of the horse so that it will be an obstacle - Eritrea or Ethiopia? Which leader is trying to buy time to lengthen reign by killing the

peace initiative – Eritrea’s or Ethiopia’s leader? Considering the current political developments on the Horn of Africa, the answers for both questions seem to be clear for the peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia.

Hence, it would make more sense if GMH could be wise and talk about the unity of our people, the unity of the opposition parties as his priority in his political agenda to get rid off the PIA if peace is to prevail in Eritrea. Without an internal peace, no one can think of an external peace. In our past struggle for independence, it was the internal factor and not the external that was decisive in driving Ethiopia out of Eritrea. History repeats itself. Therefore, to win the internal factor means to defeat the PIA. This logical strategic solution of a long term of an internal glory can only serve to prepare the next stage of managing the external factor.

But GMH could not and cannot deliver this to the people of Eritrea in this crucial period in which our people feel fatigue. On the contrary, GMH has disassociated himself from the people of Eritrea by speaking on behalf of the GoE and PIA. In a political analysis, this is to interpret that GMH is again acting as the PIA’s representative or the ambassador outside Eritrea. In a true sense, an ambassador is an honest man sent abroad to lie for his country. However, GMH does not seem to have any sign of ‘honesty’ in all his political activities. That is why it is a free option for NG89E or any other politician to think and to link the behaviour of GMH with a conspiracy theory.

In conclusion, what GMH should or could do, is, for example: i) to expose all the crimes done by the GoE and inflicted upon our people not only since May 1991 or May 1993, but since 1969, the Ad-dobha Convention (*Akeba Ad-dobha*), the time of separation between ELF (*Abbay Jebbha*) and EPLF; ii) to speak for the Eritrean human right situation, and press freedom; iii) to speak from national unity, national reconciliation, and national conference; iv) to open a debate on different important issues that are thought to divide the Eritrean people, for example, national languages, inter-state boundaries (*Awrajataat*), private properties, land ownership; v) to advocate for a political consensus among all Eritrean opposition parties, civil societies and religious institutions; and vi) to discuss on how to prepare a ground for the establishment of ‘Eritrean Parliament in Exile’ to avoid the risk of anarchy for power at a time of a political vacuum of transition.

Issue Three: Foreign Policy

History reveals that Eritrea without the support of the Sudan Government and the Sudanese people would never exist as a nation with sovereignty, today. Eritrea is land, a country, a nation and a home of population. Any population needs another population be a neighbour or else in order to survive. There is a need to understand that human beings are not like an island that is isolated that is surrounded by water. Even the island bears human beings that need the support of the neighbouring island’s people. This is a natural law linked to explain the question of human existence. Therefore, it is a basic human and social requirement to have communication and relationships with any neighbouring countries surrounding Eritrea even farther than that. When this is the factual case, why then GMH makes a false propaganda that Eritrea does not need to meet the respective governments of the neighbouring

countries thinking they are the enemies of Eritrea. Precisely, this view of GMH is the PIA's view on the other way round. But on the other hand, GMH was revealed for his involvement, for example, in the Ethiopian camp. This can be explained, as indicated before, that GMH, through the mediation of Paulos Tesfagiorgis (*Weddi Be-a-Tai*), met Ethiopian Officials in Oslo, Norway. Then why did GMH contradict his own wrong theory? Why did GMH oppose the other Eritrean opposition leaders when they try to contact the Ethiopian, Sudanese or Jemeni governments respectively? If there is no communication and relationship established and no support from neighbouring governments is offered or provided, how could any political party organise its own people those who live in the neighbouring countries? In the view of NG98E, there is nothing for nothing unless there is a political, economical and social compromise among all neighbouring countries accordingly. Do all Eritrean politicians understand this basic necessity in human life? This is not only a need but an imperative requirement for neighbouring countries to be able to live side by side in peace.

In conclusion and analysis, this is again a double standard of GMH's foreign policy.

Issue Four: EDP Leadership's Attitude towards ELF (*Abbay Jebha*) in General

GMH has never been in the position to recognise the political will and capacity of the ELF. If that was the case, the *TPLF* could not come to vandalise on the Eritrean soil on the cost of the ELF, Eritrean people and our land. Such a black history that took place in the past between the two political parties (ELF and EPLF) of one motherland, can't be forgotten. In summary, all this was a result of EPLF's 'politics of no share and care' which is an end of politics in itself. Yet, this negative attitude towards ELF still remains a long way off. If this was not the case, the EDP could have already worked with the ENA, the major political party of the ELF (*Abbay Jebha*) having thirteen organisations in the past two or three years. Instead the EDP leadership has a special preference or inclination to make a deal with ELF-RC, a faction of the ELF. This is evident with the expression of Dr Bereket Hapteselassie on August 23 2003 in London. During the question – answer session of his seminar in regard with the issue of 'Eritrean opposition parties', he said in his own words: "*Etti bezuhh emmento zigiber-rella zinneb-berre Sewrawi Baito ab kilte temmekilla*". "*Ter-nuf kalssi kessab hejji irri-E yelleckun*". The former statement makes clear that the EDP has no intention to work with the ENA. But in contrast, this statement indicates that the EDP leadership intends to work with a part of the whole rather than with a whole of the ELF.

In a political analysis, this is to interpret that the EDP leadership is trying to exploit to widen up the gap between the ENA and ELF-RC rather than trying to unite them together by bridging the gap closer.

Issue Five: Relationship between EDP & ELF Branches or Factions – i.e. EDP, ELF-RC and ELF

As indicated above, the EDP's current attempt to make a deal with ELF-RC and the ELF will not help the EDP to make even an inch of progress. Let it be clear to any

Eritrean that the NG89E is not against the idea of unity of political parties at all. But the NG89E has many reasons to criticise these parties for their faults.

Criticism one is that all these three parties are already embattled and impoverished by their own internal and external problems. This is to say that ELF and ELF-RC have never agreed to live together within the main umbrella of ENA collectively. If ELF-RC was already clean in its political identities and strategies, why then the ELF-RC has been against its sister ENA, all originating from the main root of the ELF, i.e. *Abbay Jebha*? Why the ELF-RC split itself into two? What does this splitting tell us?

Criticism two is that the contemporary and past history tells us that the EPLF / PFDJ as a whole, has been labelling and stereotyping the 'ELF political factions' as a *5th Party or Columnist, Jihad group, Mujahidin, Woyane's instrument, Ethiopia's spy etc.* How and why the EDP can now plan to work with a party that has been insulted and vilified with avalanche of words for decades? What now makes EDP to go this direction?

Criticism three is that about GMH and the EPLF / PFDJ as a whole. The EPLF / PFDJ has been against the ELF's (no matter which political party or branch from the ELF / *Abbay Jebha*) existence on the Eritrean soil. EPLF / PFDJ has never been willing to accept and recognise the ELF neither as political coalition partner nor a political party of opposition in Eritrea. Wasn't it the EPLF's dream and determination to see the elimination of the ELF? Wasn't it the EPLF intentional advocacy not to tolerate the existence of two political parties on the Eritrean soil? Wasn't it the EPLF that had strongly objected any ELF's participation on its own right in the National Referendum for Eritrea's Independence in May 1993? How on earth do GMH and his like make now a U-turn?

Criticism four is that about the EPLF as a whole. The EPLF exterminated the lives of many Eritrean ELF *Tegadelti* and the military existence of the ELF in the 1980s. This extermination of own brothers and sisters underwent with the support of the *Woyane*, i.e. TPLF. How is it now possible and so easy to sit together side by side with ELF political branches or factions? How could harsh enemies of different backgrounds come to co-operate sporadically?

Criticism five is that the consideration of the historical backgrounds and current situations of each of these three parties - EDP, ELF-RC and ELF. The outcome is that these three do not seem to have won the hearts and minds of the great majority of our people because of their negative backgrounds as highlighted already.

Criticism six is that about the EDP itself. The EDP is currently not in the position to work with the EPM and not able to unify all the members of the EPLF-DP into one? According to the survey study of NG98E, the great majority (96.7%) of the EPLF-DP are now members of the EPM. As to the study, by average 2-3% of the total number of the EPLF-DP belong today to the EDP. Why does EDP fail to have adequate members? This is because mainly of the EDP's leadership lack of honesty, openness, transparency and accountability in all its actions. As to the study, the EDP leadership is obsessed by fear of losing power on the cost of the baseless and narrow propaganda of regionalism in Eritrea.

Criticism seven is that the great majority of the EPLF-DP members through out the world have already rejected and condemned GMH's unilateral political actions since the Tuebingen meeting in Germany. At this point, two examples can be given for such rejection and condemnation of GMH's and Dr Assefaw Tekeste's leadership. These two examples are / were the members of the EPLF-DP in the United Kingdom and New York, USA. Therefore, how could GMH or Dr Assefaw Tekeste justify their approaches towards the coalition or relationship with rival parties, when they are unable to lead their own party? How could GMH or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste convince our people that they are right in doing this? Nevertheless, NG89E hopes that there would a time in which the EDP leaders would be reflective in seeing and admitting their wrongs by saying '*sorry*' to their own people.

In conclusion, as indicated above, the NG89E welcomes any attempt of movement towards political unity that is beneficiary to our Eritrean people. But, in the eyes of the Eritrean politics in general from what has been seen, heard and experienced, such unity could not be an easy task. Further, when looking through a needle into the microscope of the current situation and the background of these three rival parties of old enemies, it does not seem hard to interpret that such formula of 'political unity' or 'a friendly click' shines to be more a house of sinners rather than the house of angels for the good of Eritrea. This is because of their failure to linking their own people with the real politics in Eritrea. Further, this is not only a matter of trust but also a matter of a political party or government that is out of touch with its people. Therefore, NG98E gives its full support and advice to every party that comes and stands clean to work for unity from the heart of common interest of our people. Doing this it may count as one of the positive preconditions for every party if it is to earn a good name from its own electorates. Every party, weak or strong, concerned individual or group, should believe in the inclusion of all parties and people. They have to avoid hatred of each other recognising the strategy of '*consensus*' to establish a co-operative team. That is what '*politics*' really means. If possible, every leader should have a criterion of '*charmanistic*', i.e. someone who acts as a force of drive and someone who is *a visionary* not necessarily from the viewpoint of the appearance of the physical body of the leader but from the natural intelligence of the mind of the leader. Unfortunately, no one of these three leaders fulfils this criterion.

Issue Six: Reformation and Negotiation with PIA and the Interview of Dr. Assefaw with the Voice of America (VoA)

Any realistic, reflective and critical politician does not necessarily reject the idea of '*negotiation*' provided that it is meaningful within a given framework of conditions. To 'negotiate' with someone over something is to make a deal. As such, '*negotiation*' is one of the many aspects of a democratic rule in settling political, economical or social problems. But there are some crucial questions to be asked in doing this. The crucial questions include: 1) what is the ground for negotiation with PIA? 2) Why negotiation with PIA is an option more than any other means? 3) Are all other means tested and exhausted? 4) Who is negotiating? 5) Are all concerned political parties, religious institutions and civic societies included in the 'negotiation'? 6) For whom is the 'negotiation' after all? 7) Who benefits from the 'negotiation'? 8) What drives GMH, or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste, and their like to negotiate with PIA?

If GMH, Dr. Assefaw Tekeste, and their followers believe that a change could come through the means of *'negotiation and reformation'*, then

- a. Why did they leave Asmara for Europe and America from the very beginning?
- b. Why did they prefer to be political refugees or asylum seekers in Europe or America?
- c. Why did / do GMH, Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and their alike not go back to Eritrea and show their political muscles either against PIA or in support of PIA in an open way?
- d. What drives them to come to Europe or America at all?
- e. If they believe on *'reformation'* through the means of *'negotiation'*, then what has been their cause of protest to be against their master, PIA?
- f. What is the sense of their protest by settling in Europe or America or else where out side Eritrea?
- g. If GMH or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and their alike believe in negotiation with PIA, what have they learned from the past at all?
- h. What was the sense of becoming a signatory or signatories against the wish of PIA?
- i. Do they think that the concept of *'negotiation and reformation'* is a new philosophy or discovery or phenomenon in the Eritrean politics?

Bur Eritrea and its people have experienced many types of political games of both good and bad. There is nothing new in Eritrean politics except that all the same old intrigues of the EPLF happening now and then.

In a political analysis, such a character of GMH and his alike is to be interpreted or perceived as controversial, politics of double standard as well as an open *'apostle of PIA'*. This shows that such leading people do not only lack the capacity of political leadership but also could not see beyond their noses or eyebrows in scrutinizing the realities and politics. Again, this shows that Eritreans never learn to learn. But our wise ancestors have left for us their unforgettable lesson: *'ash-shaan ay-yigberka, mel-le-bem-min ay-yick-laa-ekka'*. Therefore, when do Eritreans learn from the past? In the view of NG98E, it dares to say we, Eritreans have difficulty to learn from realities. We, Eritreans have to accept that we are more emotionally governed rather than intellectually and that we are too weak to make our own views clearly and strongly. Instead, we have the habit to criticise others rather than to support the critic when we know the intention and content of the critics are right.

However, past and contemporary history tells us there are many factual events that can't be easily erased from the memories of Eritrean minds when considering the evil nature of the EPLF. Three examples can explain the theories of such facts and events.

Example A:

There are yet untold true stories of the so-called *MenkaE*, those who asked for a democratic rule in 1970s in which it is remained a mystery for our people.

Example B:

There were barbaric killings of the physically disabled *Tegadelti* in Mai-Habbar in 1994, those who demanded the GoE to have a better social life but ended with the loss of their own lives.

Example C:

There was an open mass demonstration of *Tegadelti* in Asmara 1993, in which they demanded the Provisional Government of Eritrea (PGoE) to have social, political and educational changes in Eritrea. But what happened in the aftermath of their demonstration, many *Tegadelti* were picked up one by one and in groups to be put in jail and some were sentenced to their deaths without the realisation of their demands of what were promised to them by Issaias Afeworki. The question is that how could PIA be trusted?

In the light of the above examples, there is one simple fact that helps us to bring to light. This fact is that if GMH and Dr. Assefaw Tekeste, or their alike believe a change could come by '*negotiation and reformation*' with PIA, where are their comrades, today, i.e. the G11 – Mahmood Sherriffo, Petros Solomon, Haile Woldetensae, etc.? Do they think their comrades, those who were the signatories, are on rehabilitation since the last 3 years? If GMH or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and their alike believe in negotiation with PIA, why are thousands and thousands of Eritrean are in jail in continuum?

Therefore, such view (of GMH, or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and their alike) for the NG89E, is not only the cheapest political will but the worst political strategy to be seen and heard. In other words, this poor political action makes an equal meaning to the Tigrigna's proverb that says '*teha-zibka ab chikka*'. The critic is not because of the idea of negotiation, but the critic is because none of these politicians like GMH, Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and their alike is / are realistic, reflective and critical in weighing up the Eritrean politics objectively; and that non of them have learned anything from the past.

If negotiation would help Eritrea under the leadership of PIA, Eritrea could not go to war with Ethiopia, Yemen, Djibouti, and the Sudan. If negotiation would help Eritrea under the leadership of PIA, the G11 (the signatories who were the ministers), the professional journalists, many individual concerned Eritreans, many religious leaders of different confessions, many *Tegadelti* and many other Eritrean civilian or businessmen could not have been put into jails. It should be emphasised that this shows that GMH and his allies like Dr. Assefaw Tekeste, Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie do not seem to have ever learned from the past. After all, according to the survey study and a reliable source of information of those who still know and knew Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie, he has never admitted that he was put behind bars of the EPLF in Sahel for three months in 1975. Some inmates and observers of the EPLF jail of that time are still alive. Of course, NG89E accepts, believes and respects such a view that Dr Bereket Habte Selassie has no obligation at all to tell the public that he was in Issaias' jail or anywhere else. Further, according to the harsh EPLF Policy, every victim of EPLF's prison is strongly mannered during the release from the '*Halewa Sewra*' (Security Centre of the Revolution, i.e. Prison)) not to tell anybody

that he or she was in a prison. It is a taboo to talk about it after the release. But, at least, Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie should admit from not telling the truth when he gave his lecture on Constitution in a public meeting on August 23 2003 in London - Stockwell, United Kingdom. In his explanations and responses to the questions raised by the attendants, he said in his own words at different times: *“emnet yedilli iyu ni mengisti; genkes amin-na intay rek-kibna. Emmnet auw-dikknaluu nerr-na netti Kqu-wam (Constitution) ab ghebri kew-ullo etti mengisti. Ne Issaias an-ne E-annellu neyrre iye. Entay-emmo yigeb-ber, amin-nayo.* When these statements translated into English, they may mean or convey the message roughly as following:

“To trust a Government is necessary. However, even though we have a trust, we have got nothing. We trusted that the Government of Eritrean would implement the Constitution. I had been trusting Issaias and/or I had had trust on Issaias. However, what could we do, even though we trusted”.

There are five incidents that Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie could not and should not trust Issaias Afeworki: one was that after his jailing in Sahel 1975. Two was that after he wrote a book in 1989 with the title *‘Reflections on the Future of the Political System in Eritrea’*. In this book, Dr Bereket Habte Selassie articulated his mind with clarity that all parties should be allowed to be part of the multiparty system in Eritrea including the ELF. However, Issaias Afeworki became snappish and demonstrated his dissatisfaction with the content of the book and rejected the idea of Dr Bereket Habte Selassie in regard with the multi-party system formation. Three was that after the so-called Berlin Manifesto (Letter of Critic written to PIA) sent to PIA that ended with a total rejection of the critic. Four was that after PIA ordered to close down the action of the ‘Constitution Committee’ led by Minister Mahmood Sheriffo. Five was that after the jailing of the ministers in 2002. The second incident was explained and confirmed by Dr Bereket Habte Selassie himself while delivering his speech to the public on the issue of the ‘Eritrean Constitution’. On the other hand, Dr. Bereket Habteselassie advises the public by saying (in his words) *“ni mengistik-kas fittow-wo ember ay-ti-em-menno. Hijji gin temmah-hirrna”*. This means according to Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie, **“you can like your government but do not trust. But now we have learned’**. At this stage, the question to be asked is that where is the end stand of Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie with his good professional career and academic knowledge and life experiences, as well as his effective lecture on Law and Constitution nationally and internationally but surrounded by controversy and critic from the public because of his mistake to make an emphasis of his ‘trust’ on Issaias Afeworki instead of saying *‘sorry’* for the public for his wrong belief.

From the viewpoint of an ethical / moral, or a political issue, it is now worthwhile to remember Socrates, the Greek philosopher for his golden statement. Socrates says that *“the unexamined life is not worth living”*. This means that every thing in life should be tested and examined to see if it has a value at all. The statement of Socrates is correct from the viewpoint of the real world, but this does not fit into the Eritrean politics in regard with GMH’s, or Dr. Assefaw Tekeste’s or Dr. Bereket Habte Selassie’s thinking about *‘reformation through negotiation’*. In fact, it is the opposite. Why, because these people already knew and still know that *negotiation* with PIA never works at all. Throughout their lives, these people have been working and cooperating with PIA. These people have been observing and examining the nature of Issaias Afeworki, at least, since the conception of the EPLF. Of course, these people

have a democratic right to give their views and express their feelings. The question is whether their views are acceptable or unacceptable, realistic or unrealistic, or objective or subjective, or right or wrong. It is imaginable or thinkable to many Eritreans that these people are old enough to know what is good or bad, first for themselves and then for Eritrea.

But there is one truth to bear in mind. This truth is that the lesson that Eritreans have learned so far is that there is nothing at all that PIA can offer the Eritrean people. Then isn't this a good proof in itself that Eritreans never learn from their past when speaking from '*reformation and negotiation*'? Therefore, what is the purpose of such a wrong political propaganda of illusion? What is the purpose of misleading the Eritrean mass to make a wrong hope? What is behind this scene of political drama, a drama that cannot be materialised? A word is enough for a wise man. However, the message in writing these five examples of incidents is to make political intellectuals self-reflective by considering the realities in Eritrea, but such people do not want to learn. When comparing the three politicians (GMH, Dr. Assefaw Tekeste and Dr. Berekt Habte Selassie) in terms of their backgrounds in education, profession, life experiences, and their world-views, then NG89E cannot blame GMH for his misdeeds and poor intellectuality but it blames more the intellectuals those who are registered in the book of the scholarly club but act in closed doors.

In the eyes of NG89E, such thinking of '*negotiation and reformation*' is not only ill but just a waste of golden time and resources. If GMH and his alike still stick to this false political slogan of '*reformation and negotiation*', it is no more than a plot of political conspiracy in making a handover of transfer of Government between PIA's handful loyalties and the GMH and his alike. All this is to occur without the consent of our Eritrean people, the majority of our Eritrean political parties and the concerned religious institutions, etc.

Therefore, the conclusion is that NG89E does not see any point to negotiate with a failed Government of PIA that has never condemned violence on its own people can act in any sphere of public life. As a result, NG89E advises any individual, political party, group or community to spurn offer of talk with the GoE as long as the GoE does not ask publicly but constructively by fulfilling the demands of our people without '**butts and ifs**'. On the other hand, all Eritreans should come together if they are to secure '*our third liberation*'. We can at this point identify some of our needs. There is no freedom, no independence, or no liberation without a total unity within a diversity of our people. This is our basic requirement that every Eritrean has to recognise. To deny this requirement is to fix a cloud in the sky. To deny this requirement is to gamble with the fate of our people. If we are not successful, let us not blame PIA and his cronies alone but also ourselves for not doing the right ways.

Note: NG89E welcomes any constructive feedback

The banner of the truth of our oppressed people will win and '*our third liberation*' will come sooner rather than later.

Happy New Year 2005
Negarritt-Gazetta 89E (NG89E)