

A Report From Ethiopia: Famine and Revolution in Africa

Rod Bush

As an editor of *Contemporary Marxism* I spent a month traveling in Ethiopia, meeting with officials of the Ethiopian Relief and Rehabilitation Commission, other government officials in regions and towns, and with many Ethiopian citizens. While there I also met with representatives of the liberation movements in South Africa and in Namibia. We went to Ethiopia to investigate how the Ethiopian government and people understood the famine and what they were doing about it, and to talk with African intellectuals, professionals, and working people about events in Africa. The famine throughout Africa and the burgeoning movement in opposition to apartheid in South Africa had placed Africa at center stage in the daily life of the American people. The Reagan administration had embarked upon a propaganda campaign alleging that the reason for the famine in Africa was the socialist system in Ethiopia and the predominance of state-owned enterprises in Africa. Reagan's cure for the misery of the African people was very simple: they need more private enterprise. The Reagan administration advocated the same cure for apartheid in South Africa, contrary to the wishes of the anti-apartheid forces there.

Further informing our decision to visit Ethiopia at this time was Marlene Dixon's five years of intensive examination of the Reagan counterrevolution, both in domestic and foreign policy. She had dissected Reagan's policy of rolling back the socialist revolutions throughout the world. Yet she maintained that the biggest tool of the counterrevolutionary forces was the famine. Reagan and the New Right would move to take advantage of this calamitous situation, incorporating it in their designs to discredit the Soviet Union and undermine the socialist states wherever possible. Just 10 years ago liberation seemed to be on the verge of spreading to all of Africa, and a bright future seemed assured. Now in the West there was

still hope about the future of Africa, but amidst great confusion and uncertainty. We wanted to understand how Africans themselves viewed the situation in Africa.

SOUTHERN AFRICA AS THE KEY LINK

When Angola and Mozambique won their liberation from Portuguese colonial rule in 1975, racist South Africa's situation was drastically changed from a nation bordered by allies or countries that were economically dependent on her, to a nation bordered by countries embarking on a process of socialist construction and pledged to supporting the liberation movements in Namibia and South Africa itself. Since that time South Africa and the United States have been involved in a variant of the soft cop/hard cop routine with the nations of Southern Africa: the U.S. would offer countries aid if they would deal with South Africa (thus bringing an end to the worldwide embargo of that country), while South Africa itself engaged in a combination of military attacks, the arming of mercenaries to wage economic sabotage, and the punitive use of its own economic strength against the frontline friends of the liberation movements.

As Marlene Dixon pointed out in "Militarism as Foreign Policy—Reagan's Second Term" (see *Contemporary Marxism* 10), this is part of a global strategy being pursued by U.S. imperialism. It is designed to slowly sap a nation of its strength, to lay the groundwork for a direct military intervention or a coup. In Southern Africa, particularly in the cases of Mozambique and Angola, this is most evident. Both Mozambique and Angola have suffered severe economic damage as a result of the attacks. Mozambique was forced to sign the "Nkomati Accord," which sought to limit the extent to which ANC could operate within its borders. The brutal South African regime is also attempting to force Angola to sign such an agreement, which would mean curbing Angola's support for ANC and SWAPO. The military occupation of Namibia is costing the South African government \$500 million per year and military expenditures have risen from 8% of the budget in 1972 to 17% by 1982. Casualty levels have steadily risen on the Namibia-Angola front, trucks are rumored to be returning full of corpses, and there is a growing anti-draft movement in South Africa that is not just limited to white radicals.

Within the last six to eight months, however, the situation within South Africa itself has become increasingly untenable. We cannot minimize the victories of the people of Mozambique, Angola, and Zimbabwe. The black people of South Africa saw that the very people whom they had worked with in the mines of South Africa

could win their independence against white colonial governments, so victory is now seen as possible in their lifetime. The growing power of SWAPO clearly strengthened the hand of the revolutionary forces within South Africa. Although the final liberation of South Africa will not be tomorrow, the power of the people has shaken the racist regime to its foundations, and it can no longer continue to rule in the same old way.

The militants of the ANC now must clearly come to grips with the new situation and reassess what it will take to fully take advantage of this unprecedented opportunity to advance the mass struggle within South Africa. In future issues of *CM* we will be publishing some of the results of this ongoing reassessment of strategy, as well as commentaries from SWAPO and the liberation movements in power in Mozambique, Angola, and Zimbabwe about the situation in Southern Africa as a whole.

Traditionally the most important support for liberation movements in Africa has come from neighboring countries that could be used as a rear area, relatively secure from the pursuit of enemy forces. In Southern Africa today, as we have pointed out, the U.S. and South Africa have pursued a policy of destabilization of the frontline opponents of apartheid. Another important source for the liberation movement in South Africa is also the target of destabilization efforts: Ethiopia. During my travels in Ethiopia I met with representatives of the ANC in Addis Ababa. They told of the exemplary anti-imperialist role that is now being played by Socialist Ethiopia, which is providing a considerable amount of material support for their movement, despite Ethiopia's own difficulties.

There is little dependable information available to us about what is happening in Ethiopia, and what information we do receive is grossly distorted by the massive propaganda campaign being waged by the Right and the Left in the West. On the one hand there is the Reagan administration's attempt to discredit the socialist revolutions in Africa, and the allies of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, large sections of the Western Left are influenced by the Eritrean Peoples Liberation Front (EPLF) and have simply not been open to an objective assessment of the Ethiopian revolution. Partially from materials gathered on the trip to Ethiopia this summer, the editors will be putting together a special issue of *CM* on the famine in Africa, focusing on Ethiopia.

In reality the greatest counterrevolutionary force in Africa today is the famine itself. Although it seems to be a cruel trick of nature, in actuality it is a combination of ecological disaster as a result of impoverishment and the effects of years of systematic exploitation of the African continent. The effects have proven to be deadly. It is

for this reason that the propaganda barrage against Socialist Ethiopia and the actions that the Ethiopian government has taken are so important to us.

THE POLITICS OF FAMINE RELIEF IN ETHIOPIA

Prerevolutionary Ethiopia was long a U.S. ally, although, unlike most other African countries, it was able to resist the clutches of direct colonial domination. The 1974 revolution snatched from the U.S. foreign policy managers a prized position on the geopolitically significant Red Sea. This earned the new revolutionary government the unremitting hostility of U.S. elites, in particular of the rabidly anticommunist legions of the New Right. It is therefore not surprising that the rise of the New Right within the U.S. government would mean that food would be used as a weapon against the new government of Ethiopia. We are witnessing a conscious policy to destabilize Ethiopia in the context of a calamitous ecological disaster affecting all Africa after decades of dependent economic development that has rendered the population of the African countries vulnerable to famine.

The Reverend Charles Elliot, a British relief official, charged that the U.S. and Britain had intentionally delayed large-scale relief assistance to Ethiopia in the belief that widespread famine would trigger the overthrow of the Provisional Military Administrative Council (popularly known as the Dergue, an Amharic word meaning "committee of equals") and bring a pro-Western regime to power. (Indeed, some observers believe that the famine of 1972-73 was a major reason for the overthrow of the Haile Selassie regime.) As early as 1983 there is evidence that the U.S. in particular prevented a timely provision of relief aid. At the World Bank meeting in September 1983, France is reported to have proposed a special-aid program for Africa. Dominique Brustel, an official of the French Ministry of Cooperation, reported, "The Americans were not interested, to say the least...They blocked the funds" (*Newsweek*, 11/26/84).

Liberal journalist Jonathan Tucker, whose account of the famine is unfortunately biased by the perspective of the Eritrean and Tigrayan secessionist movements, makes clear that the U.S. government sent inadequate amounts of aid to Ethiopia until October 23, 1984, when a graphic BBC film of the famine was broadcast on the NBC Nightly News. The shocking images of suffering and death triggered an outpouring of public concern and forced the Reagan administration to expand its aid sharply. Yet Dawit Wolde Giorgis, of Ethiopia's Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC), had made a plea for increased aid in March 1984, six months earlier.

According to David Ottoway of the *Washington Post* Foreign Service, the March RRC Report warned that Ethiopia faced "a potential disaster of considerable magnitude," but the response was woefully inadequate. These months of delay led to an untold number of deaths. The political motivation on the part of the Western powers is clear when we contrast their policy toward Ethiopia with their positive response to a quiet appeal from pro-Western Kenya for 1.2 million tons of corn (*Washington Post Weekly*, 10/1/84).

Although U.S. assistance to Ethiopia increased after the broadcast of the BBC film, until recently the Hickenlooper Amendment to the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act had been used to prevent any developmental assistance to Ethiopia. Thus the U.S. could give food to starving people, but could not participate in a food for work program that would enable the Ethiopians to build roads in this vast country, when a major cause of starvation is that there are not roads that provide access to large parts of the population (*Washington Post Weekly*, 12/17/84).

Another example of Washington's sinister manipulation of Ethiopia's plight has been its attitude toward the resettlement programs. Although a recent World Bank report concluded that "a measure of population relocation is absolutely desirable," the Soviet Union is the only international donor which supports the government's resettlement plans. The United States Agency for International Development, which prepared studies encouraging resettlement a decade ago, is now a leading opponent of resettlement. The U.S. has been largely successful in pressuring other Western donors not to support the government's resettlement program. (*WP Weekly*, 6/17/85).

Despite the clear evidence of the Western capitalist nations' role in the current crisis, Western journalists, as well as pro-Western African journalists focus on what African leaders should have been doing in the years preceding the drought. African leaders are said to have mismanaged their economies, squandered national wealth, and "literally [thrown] away the future as they jostled with one another for personal power and gain. When it was not greed that moved them it was folly and gullibility." (*Newsweek*, 11/26/84). The *Newsweek* article from which this quote is taken was illustrated with a popular Ethiopian poster of Mengistu Haile (captioned, "a promengistu mural in Addis Ababa: Many of Africa's pains are self-inflicted"); one would expect the article to contain a devastating critique of the development options chosen or ignored by African leaders. Instead, the author admits, in so many words, that perhaps Africa could have achieved more if the developed world had paid better prices for its goods and had been more prepared to lower

barriers against the continent's manufactured or semi-manufactured exports; or if the oil price hikes of the last decade had not depleted the foreign-exchange reserves of the oil-importing countries; or if Africa had not fallen victim to predatory multinational corporations bent on dumping obsolete technologies in Africa. Despite the acknowledgment of these truths, however, the overall thrust of *Newsweek's* article, entitled "Placing the Blame," is that it is the socialist model which accounts for the famine in Africa.

The human tragedy of Africa's famine is reduced by the Reagan administration and its allies on the Right to another tool in their global anticommunist crusade. Democratic Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont charged that "The hungry kids are seen by some downtown as 'little commies,' so the grain just sits there." Meanwhile, the belated Western food relief is accompanied by large doses of political rhetoric. "The word is out that the West delivers the food," boasted U.S. AID administrator M. Peter McPherson after one trip to Ethiopia (*Newsweek*, 11/26/84).

The West delivers food, true; but they refuse to deliver the means for its distribution. This is yet another tactic designed to lay blame for the famine's devastation on the current Ethiopian government, even though it was the years of U.S. domination under the Selassie regime that created the underdevelopment which today means the country has neither the trucks nor passable roads to make possible the efficient delivery of food relief.

U.S. SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION?

There seems no end to Western hypocrisy as the blatantly political approach to food aid taken by the Reagan administration is now being projected upon the Ethiopians. Thus *Newsweek* accuses Ethiopia's "Marxist regime" of being willing "to play 'death politics' with food aid." According to *Newsweek*, certain unnamed Western aid officials say that the Ethiopian government is refusing to allow food or medicine to reach the starving people in the northern Tigre and Eritrean provinces, where much of the countryside is supposedly controlled by antigovernment rebels. Vice President George Bush has asserted that they can no longer accept the alleged failure of the government to provide food in these regions. Next year U.S. AID officials "hope to move as much as 200,000 tons of food directly to the rebel-held region" (*Newsweek*, 6/3/85).

Such a concern for the "Marxist" rebels of the EPLF and the TPLF (Tigrean Peoples Liberation Front) is indeed touching for a government which has always been on the wrong side in national liberation struggles. This is similar to the hypocritical concern expressed for Nicaragua's Miskito Indians by the government of a na-

tion which is based on the near extinction of the Indian population of the United States and the consignment of the majority of the survivors to reservations.

To be sure, the secessionist movements in the Northern regions of Ethiopia have legitimate roots in the resistance to what the revolutionary Ethiopian government now calls the feudo-bourgeois order that was overthrown in 1974. National liberation movements are always a united front with representatives of all the patriotic classes fighting to liberate their territory from oppressive forces. The 1974 revolution which overthrew Haile Selassie, however, changed the political situation in Ethiopia, and should have been the basis for a reconciliation with the EPLF. The reasons why there has not been such a reconciliation undoubtedly have complex roots, including the blood that has already been spilled. But the existing fight for "liberation" from a socialist government cannot have taken place without a significant role being played by the non-Marxist and bourgeois elements within the front. The statement attributed to the general secretary of EPLF that they are not Marxist must have been an appeal to the reactionary Arab states who now constitute the main international support, other than large sections of the Western New Left, for the Eritrean movements. The Western Left, of course, nurtured the Eritrean militants and was educated by them over a long period of time as the Eritrean movements represented a progressive tendency against the Haile Selassie regime. Out of loyalty to their friends in the EPLF, many Western leftists have refused to really analyze the Ethiopian reality since the profound changes brought by the 1974 revolution. They have accepted at face value the accusations of the Eritrean fronts that Ethiopia is now a military dictatorship. The situation in Ethiopia is very complex, and the oversimplifications of the Eritreans and others who attempt to absolutize the right of nations to self-determination is decidedly un-Marxist. How would the Marxist supporters of the Eritreans interpret the following statement from a leader of the EPLF: "We are the inheritors of the kingdom of Axum; we will have nothing to do with this Shoan regime."

SOCIALISM, IMPERIALISM, AND THE FAMINE

When all is said and done we have to understand the attitudes of the Western press and conservative Western governments as a reaction against 1) the worldwide struggle of the peoples of the capitalist periphery for independence and socialism and 2) the Soviet Union and the socialist states as the prime defenders of the right of nations to control their own economies and to undertake development strategies not tied to the fortunes of the Western-dominated capitalist

world economy. Why else would *Time Magazine* choose the downfall of the Shagari government in Nigeria in January 1984 to list a litany of failure throughout Sub-Saharan Africa (with the notable exception of South Africa, of course)? In this article, *Time* points to widespread economic decline since independence, meddling by Cuba and the Soviet Union, a pervasive corruption, the lack of foreign exchange to purchase parts, the lack of technical expertise to repair imported technology, and the lack of values of a population which has undergone too rapid a process of urbanization. (*Time*, 1/16/84).

The *Time* correspondent's message is made clear:

Much of black Africa has no choice but to depend on foreign aid to pull out of its current economic difficulties. After decades of independence, many African leaders, once seduced by the promises of doctrinaire socialism, have accepted the advantages of private initiative and the free-market system.

But where is the truth here? Those who criticize African leaders for brandishing socialism as an ideal most assuredly understand the difference between Marxist revolutionaries and "African socialism." As a matter of fact the West's initial acceptance of the Ethiopian revolution was based on the assessment of U.S. observers in Ethiopia that Ethiopians were pushing for an African socialism which they did not feel was antagonistic to Western interests. In actuality socialist revolution is new to Africa (starting in the middle 1970s), and these are infant revolutions, which immediately came under attack by South Africa and the United States.

To say that it is socialism which causes the drought in Africa is patently absurd when only three of the 30 countries threatened by famine are socialist. Moreover, socialism is historically only a recent arrival on the world scene, with socialist societies struggling to construct egalitarian and just societies out of what existed before. In the modern day this means, for the most part, to construct new societies out of the wreckage and underdevelopment created by imperialist exploitation of Third World countries. When you add to this legacy the U.S. government's sophisticated repertoire of boycotts, sabotage, denial of aid and expertise, and physical destruction of vital economic facilities (tactics of destabilization explained by Dixon in "Militarism as Foreign Policy—Reagan's Second Term"), the absurdity of blaming socialism for the crisis in Africa becomes all the more clear.

For the most part African economies are a mixture of subsistence farming and the production of certain raw-material products for export, primarily to Western Europe and the United States. They import most of their manufactured goods from these same

countries. Fundamentally the world-economy functions in such a way that primary products are sold at relatively low rates (in terms of reward for the labor embodied in them) and manufactured goods are bought at relatively high rates, an exchange which is considerably less favorable to primary producers than the pattern of internal trade that has evolved in the industrialized countries. An added problem is that most of the African countries have single-product export economies which are extremely vulnerable to sudden crisis, given the frequent and large price fluctuations for their products. The current contraction in the world economy is thus worsening the terms of trade for the truly peripheral countries of Africa and has meant that their nonessential products have found a weak world market. Furthermore, the impoverishment of Africa, which necessitates a daily struggle just for survival, means that the peasantry is reluctant to engage in conservationist policies and other changes which would be necessary to a final solution to the drought. It is within this context that we understand the reason why the impoverished nations of Africa are bearing the brunt of death from starvation. Only a coordinated effort by a coherent government would be able to change the current situation.

ETHIOPIA TAKES ON THE FAMINE

As for the accusations leveled against Socialist Ethiopia, they will be effectively refuted by the Ethiopians themselves in the upcoming issue of *CM* on the "Famine in Africa." In this issue we will also have a number of articles which analyze the political economy of famine in Africa in some depth. What we want to provide now, however, is a visitor's overview of the situation in Ethiopia.

There is certainly a great deal of racist arrogance in the manner in which Ethiopia is covered by the Western press, as well as in the general coverage of African events. The arrogance of some of the Western journalists that I met, their blindness to their own short-sightedness and biases against people from a different culture were astounding. This of course was not universally true, and there were important exceptions.

Ethiopia is truly a great school of world politics, an ancient civilization which resisted direct colonial rule, but a society similar in some ways to Cuba, with its strong U.S. ideological influence among some sections of the population. The Ethiopians are indeed proud of their achievements, proud of their independence, and are nobody's pawns. They have effectively mobilized humanitarian sentiment in the West, and have enlisted all of the resources in their country to deal with the famine, in sharp contrast to the policies of the U.S.-supported Selassie government. During the famine of 1973-74 in

Wello, the Haile Selassie regime simply ignored the situation, while 200,000 people died of starvation. Traditionally peasants have been a powerless group, not sufficiently concentrated and organized to be a threat to a government, so their needs were easily ignored. Under the new government, however, the priority given to the famine in Ethiopia is beyond question.

In 1974 the Revolutionary Government in Ethiopia created the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC). The RRC is a super-agency that was created to deal with the effects of cyclical drought in Ethiopia. The RRC has an Early Warning System which monitors the danger of drought and famine, it keeps track of the number of people affected and the number of people served, and is responsible for seeking solutions, for example, by devising resettlement schemes. The RRC is also responsible for coordinating the massive amounts of aid that are coming in from the donor community, and for keeping track of the amount of aid given. The Ethiopians of course correctly see the relief effort as addressing the immediate emergency, and that the long-range solution is that people have to be resettled from the ancient, overused land in the North to the more fertile and unsettled areas of Ethiopia. Thus the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission includes departments that deal with international aid and with resettlement. They have a central office in Addis Ababa and 11 branch offices in the administrative regions. Western relief officials report that the RRC is made up of highly motivated, concerned, and compassionate people, who constitute the link between the donor agencies and the people, assessing the level of need throughout the countryside, and keeping closely in touch with the various communities.

The seriousness of the revolution in Ethiopia is indicated above all by the change in the power relations between the city and the countryside. Although many urban dwellers are resentful, the cities are having to carry significant responsibility for dealing with the drought in the countryside. While I was there, university staff and students were in the process of being mobilized (or compelled, in their eyes) to go to the countryside for three months to assist with the resettlement effort. There was considerable resistance to this among people that I spoke to, although no one really disagreed in principle about the necessity to do something. In the midst of a nation's monumental effort to stop mass starvation, it is this personal selfishness, this resistance to the redistribution of the benefits of society, limited though they may be, which gets elevated in the Western press to some kind of democratic ideal. Indeed in the West, democracy is almost always synonymous with the right of the more

powerful to maintain their privileges and economic advantages, while the politically weakest segments of the population pay for it as they must.

That the highest priority is being given to the famine is again indication of the extent of revolutionary change in Ethiopia. Ethiopian society is being turned inside out to resolve the crisis. Peasants in the Southern and Southwestern regions are chipping in to help newly arrived peasants from the North, who are from different nationalities than themselves. The hypocritical accusations about violations of the right of people to self-determination is hollow alongside such elementary acts of solidarity among the peasants from different national groups in Ethiopia.

Ethiopia, in fact, has long known secessionist groups on the "Marches of the Empire." Ancient Abyssinia, which originated in what are the northern provinces of Ethiopia, has over time shifted its political center of gravity southward. The political identity of the peoples of that region have been affected not only by successive occupations of Islamic and European invaders, but also by the rise of the nationalities in the South to political ascendancy in Ethiopia. In some ways the North is typical of certain sections of Africa where more developed regions feel that they can do better on their own. Thus despite the Marxist ideology of the EPLF and the TPLF, in some ways they are classical secessionists, which is clear in the pronouncements of some of their leaders. In talking to the average Ethiopian I heard the comment that "the Eritreans are like Europeans, they like to work hard and they think they are better than we are."

TOWARD AN OBJECTIVE VIEW OF THE ETHIOPIAN REVOLUTION

Having traveled to Ethiopia, it is quite astounding how much our view of Ethiopia is based on the culture of anticommunism which has been nourished in the United States in the 20th century, and especially in the post-Second World War period of U.S. hegemony within the capitalist world system. As for those progressive intellectuals who arrogantly dismiss the Ethiopians because of an alleged low level of Marxism in their official announcements, their intellectual biases must be re-examined. They should also stop to think to what extent their views are informed by the Marxist intelligentsia who vied for power against the leaders of the revolution and lost, or by disenchanted intellectuals who decided to desert the hardships of the revolution when they could not get their way.

We do not attempt here to present an apologia for the Ethiopian revolution. They do not need such an apology. Their accomplish-

ments speak for themselves, that is, for all who would examine them objectively. Nonetheless, the Ethiopians are in a difficult position. People tend to link the worsening conditions in Ethiopia to the fact that they had a socialist revolution, rather than to the world economic crisis which set in during the 1970s and which affects all the nations of the world, capitalist and socialist. There is also little understanding of the policies of the U.S. to systematically and directly undermine the Ethiopian revolution. We must not underestimate the extent to which the U.S. views the rise to power of socialist movements in Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe as a fundamental threat to their interests: to their control over militarily strategic areas such the Cape, the Horn, and the Indian Ocean; over strategic minerals found in these areas; and over substantial African investments. Thus, as indicated above, the U.S. has embarked on a conscious strategy to pour aid into the areas where the secessionists are operating to reinforce the belief that it is the socialist government which is responsible for the famine.

The Ethiopian government seems to be proceeding very steadily along a revolutionary path, although it is criticized by some as a revolution from above. The Ethiopian Workers Party believes that the working class needs to mature before power can increasingly be placed in its hands. In the meantime, the revolution's leadership refuses to entrust power into the hands of Marxist intellectuals; the class instincts and experience of that leadership have taught it to fear and distrust them. Thus the party still seems to be most firmly based among the lower ranks of the military, although mass organizations are in the process of being built, of which the Peasant Associations seem to be the largest and strongest.

If this is a deemed a heresy we should at least remember Cabral's contention that for historical reasons, the only class that is in a position to be the heirs of the colonial or neocolonial state is the petty bourgeoisie. They are the class with the educational background to understand the reality of imperialist domination and to be able to administer the state apparatus inherited from colonialism or the neocolonial front men for imperialism. (It is only in South Africa that the working class is sufficiently large and mature to play its historical role.) We may question Cabral's contention that the petty bourgeoisie would commit suicide as a class, but then witness the revolutionary leaders emerging from the lower ranks of the African petty bourgeoisie. Indeed it could be that it is the class struggle born of this act of suicide by some members of the revolutionary organization, and not by others, which forms the context for the continuation of the class struggle within the revolutionary party itself.

Clearly, we have barely scratched the surface here, for the Ethiopian revolution is a great school of revolutionary experience. The relief effort itself is also a tremendous example of the generosity of ordinary people in the West, who have pressured their governments to redress years of unequal development. Yet we would be amiss if we did not also see the propaganda efforts of the Western governments to manipulate the relief efforts as part of a much larger game plan to discredit and destabilize the socialist states and the Soviet Union. M. Peter McPherson's exclamation that the West delivers the food is not to be taken lightly, for the move to pour relief into the secessionist relief agencies instead of the legitimate government in Ethiopia is simply another part of the rightist counterrevolution. It is also a human tragedy of catastrophic proportions.