

ትግላችን

አለም አቀፍ የኢትዮጵያ ተግራዎች ግብር
ወርሃዊ መፅሔት

በአውሮፓ የኢትዮጵያ ተግራዎች ግብር የተዘጋጀ

የ "ጊዜያዊ መገገሥት" የአድሃሪያት ቀዝተ
ወይስ አገልግሎት ተገባ?

የመፅሔት አዘጋጅ በርድ፣

c/o P.O.BOX 3198

103 64 STOCKHOLM 3

SWEDEN

ልዩ ዕትም

ጥር 1968

ጥር 2

ይዘት / ጥቅጣ / CONTENT /

- ግንባታ - የጊዜያዊ መንግሥት ጥያቄ	ገጽ 1
- ከተገባቸው የጥር 1 1967 ገጽ 21-28 የጊዜያዊ መንግሥት ጥያቄ ..	7
- ከተገባቸው የጥር 1 1967 ገጽ 50-58 / ተገባቸው... /	11
- ከተገባቸው የጥር 2 1967 .. ለአገባቢ ከተሰጠ መልስ	16
- ከተገባቸው ዘፍ የጥር 2 1967 / ርዕስ አገጽ /	18
- ከተገባቸው ዘፍ የጥር 3 1967 / አደጃ ባዮች ሲያጋለጡ /	22
- ከተገባቸው ዘፍ የጥር 4 1967 / አገገገና በሌላ ጊዜያዊ መንግሥት / ..	34
- ከ1955ው በሌላው ጠቅላላ ጥያቄ ውስጥ	44
- ከተገባቸው ዘፍ የጥር 1 1967	47
- The Question of a People's Government - Historical Experiences	50
- A Provisional Revolutionary Government or an Elective Provisional Government - Two Lines and Tactics in the 1905 revolution	55
- The Question of Provisional Popular Government in Ethiopia. 63	
- Quotations from Lenin: on the Conditions and class content of a provisional revolutionary gov't	68

ግሪፍ - በየጊዜው ለሚደረጉ አገገገጃዊ የታይት ስህተቶች አገባቢያቸውን ይቀርታ
አገገገጃዊ ባለፉት ዓመታት ላይ የሚከተሉት ግሪፍ አገገገጃዊ ስህተቶች ሲከሰቱ፡፡
ኢ.ዘፍ ሐዳር 1968 የጥር 4 / ለዓካቲያቸው / ገጽ 16 መጠር 10 ላይ
peasantry የሚለው petty bourgeoisie ተብሎ ይነበብ
ገጽ 53 መጠር 5 ላይ and not the era .. / ናት ተረባታይ /
ታይት የጥር 1 ተሰባስቦ 1968 - ገጽ 25 መጠር 2 ጊዜያዊ መንግሥት የሚለው
ባያስገናኝለትም ተብሎ ይነበብ ፡፡

"Tell the people, I, we were not strong enough to launch a rising and be victorious in a rising....Don't cover up your weakness with a belief in miracles....Who ever talks of (revolution, liberty and popular representation, without actually working at the ladder needs to attain (them), at the uprising to win them, is liar and a humbug, who is merely deceiving you" (Lenin, 1905)

ግንባታ : የጊዜያዊ መንግሥት ጥያቄ

በዚህ ሰዓትም ለአገባቢያቸው የምናጥርበው የአውሮፓ ግህበር ባለፈው ዓመት በለዚህ ፍጹም አድሃሪና አባባቸው ያለ ባዘጋጃቸው ጽሁፍ የተረጋገጠና ታላቁ ሊኒን ሕገመንግሥታዊ ተዘግቶ የተሰጠው አድሃሪ መፈክርቱን በግልጽ ከላፋቸው ምርት ጽሁፍ የተወጣጡ የተሰጡ ነው፡፡

ግህበራቸውን ይህ መፈክር ከተወረወረበት ጊዜ ይምር አስከዳሪ ይረባጥ፤ የመፈክሩን አድሃሪነት ተገልጦ ጥታቸውን ላይ ታስተውለው አመለከቷል፡፡ የዚህ መፈክር መወርወር የሕዝብ ጠላቶችን የሚጠቅም የብሬቲን ሕዝብ ተገልጦ የሚገኝ መሆኑን አመለከቷል፡፡ የሊት ዩ ጽያ ሕዝቦች አጣፋፊ የተገልጸው ጥያቄ - የመደራደሪያ ጥያቄ - በዚህ አባባቸው አድሃሪ መፈክር አገገገጃዊ ታገሏል፡፡

ይህ መፈክር ሕዝቡ በታላቅ አብዮታዊ ተገልጦ ላይ በሚገኙበት ወቅት በጠቅላላ በብዙ የገጠነ ከባድ ተራጭ ክፍሎች ዘንድ ተቀባይነት በሚገኝ የሕዝቡን ተገልጦ ላይ ጥታቸውን ሀፍ ተራጭቸውን ሲያወናግድ አልተረፈም፡፡ የብሬቲን ሕዝብ ተገልጦ ከሌላ አቅጣጫ የሚያስፈልግ የአብዮታዊ አድገት የሚያፋጥኑ መፈክሮችን በባይገባዊ መንገድ ተጠቅሞ ተገልጦ የሚፈራ የወዛደራ ፓርቲ አስባለፍረ ይረባጥ፤ የገጠነ ከባድ ተራጭ ልዩ ልዩ ክፍሎች እንደዚህ የሚባሉ አባባቸው መፈክር በመወርወር ለተወሰነ ጊዜም ሲሆን ታገዩ የሕዝብ ሊያወናግዱ የተገለጹ አቅጣጫ ሊያስቱ አገገገጃዊ መታወቅ አለበት፡፡ ግህበራቸው የዚህን መፈክር አድሃሪነትና ግጥም ሊያጋለጥ ሲነባ ታገዩ ሕዝብ በዚህ የተራጭ ለ ምድባጠለቅ አድሃሪ መፈክር ተቃዋሚ አገገገጃዊ አገገገጃዊ የወቅቱን ለግብርነት ነበር፡፡

ከአብዮታዊ ተገልጦ የበለጠ አብዮታዊ ተምህርት መቅሰሚያ አካባቢ፤ ከአብዮታዊ ተገልጦ የበለጠ የሰህተት ግሪፍ መስተዋት የለም፡፡ በመጀመሪያው ገደም በዚህ መፈክር የተደለሉ ሀፍ ተራጭቶች ታገዩ ይህን ፍጹም አድሃሪ ጊዜያዊ አጣፋፊ ተገባቸው የሚጠፍን መፈክር እርገፍ እርገው የለው በወቅት የነፍ ጥያቄያቸው ላይ - ለጥቅስ ረቀቅ መብቶች ለሰጠው ሕዝብ መደራደሪያ መታወቅ መታገል ላይ - ሊያተኩሩ ይችላሉ፡፡ ይህ በመጀመሪያ ደረጃ የአገገጃዊ ዓመት አብዮታዊ ተገልጦ ያለፈው ተምህርት ነው፡፡ በሁሉም ደረጃ የአውሮፓው አብዮታዊያን ያላቋረጠ የርእዮተሞላቸው ተገልጦ ውጤት ነው፡፡

ይህም ሆኖ ገንዘብም ይህ መፈክር አለፋለት ልገል አገገገጃዊ፡፡

እነዚህ የፖለቲካ ድርጅቶች የወዘደረጁ ፓርቲዎች በዚህ ፓርቲ መሪነት ላይ የሚመሰረተው፣
 ወዘደረጁ ለርሶለደር ተባብሮ ላይ የተገነባ የአገዳዊነት ገንባር ናቸው። የታወቀ ሠራዊቱም
 በዚህ ገንባር የሚሠራው ከባድ ሕዝብ ያሳተመለት ገንባር ብሄር ሳይሆን በሕዝብ
 ላይ የተገነባው የባሕር ሕዝብ የራሱ ሕዝባዊ ምር ያይላል። እነዚህ በሌላ ጥያቄ
 ዓይነት ድርጅት ሊተኩ ለይቻለች። በሌላ ጥያቄ ዓይነት ወቅት ተደራጅተው ያሉት የምያ
 ማህበራት እነዚህም ያንዳንዱን ቦታ ሊያሟሉና ሊኖሩ ሊተኩ ለይቻለች። እነዚህን
 ባህሪ ጊዜ በሌላ ጥያቄ ያሉ የምያ ማህበሮች ለገደፖለቲካ ሥልጣን መወጣት መባሪያ ለርጉ
 ማቅረብ ለገደፍ ነገር የአውነተኛ የፖለቲካ ሥልጣን መወጣት መባሪያ ያያቸዋል። ለገደፖለቲካ
 ለባሕር ጊዜ የዘናጋት ነው። ሁለተኛ የታወቀው ለወርድ ባላ የባሕር ጊዜ ሥልጣን ለገደፖለቲካ
 እነዚህ የምያ ማህበሮች ዛሬ የደርጉን ፀረ ሕዝባዊነት ለገዢው በመታወቅ ለሕዝባዊነት
 መብቶች በሚደረገው ተገል የሚኖራቸውን ተገደና ከኖተኛ ለባተኛ ማደናኛ ነው።

ለገንዘብ የቀደም ገዢ መደቦች የሚኖሩ መባሪያ ያያቸውን ሳይወጡና ለባሕር
 ሕዝብ የሚገባት ሥልጣን ለመገደብ ከላይ በመቀበላቸው ድርጅቶች ሳይዘጋጁና ሳይደረጁ
 ጥያቄ ዓይነት ሕዝባዊነት ያለው መንግስት ሊሞክር ለይቻለች ካልገኘች የሌላ ጥያቄ ሰራ
 ሕዝብ ዛሬ መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመወጣት ለገደፖለቲካ ገልጽ ነው። እነዚህ ሁኔታዎች
 ሳይታዩና ሳይታዩ ሰራው ሕዝብ ለፖለቲካ ሥልጣን ሳይዘጋጁና ሳይደረጁ ለሁሉ ሊት ጥያቄ
 የሚገዛውን የምር ያይላች ደርገ ሊተካ ሊጸቅ ለይቻለች። ዛሬ ደርጉ ሊተኩ የሚችሉት
 ባሕር ወይም ከርሱ የባሉ ፀረ ሕዝብ ያይላች ቦታ ናቸው። እነዚህን ሁሉም ይህንኑ
 ለውጥ ዛሬውን ሕዝባዊነት መንግስት የተገነባ መንግስት ለገንባላን ይላሉ።

"The right of the people to establish a democraticall constit-
 uted civilian government, and to form political parties."

ያለ ድርጅት መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመወጣት መነሳት ጥን ይዞ ገዢ
 ነው። ያለ ድርጅት ሰራው ሕዝብ ጥን ለገንባላን ለገዢ ይላሉ የጊዜያዊ መንግስት
 ደጋፊዎች። የደርጉ ፀረ ሕዝባዊነት ለገዢው የመደራጀት መብት ለሕዝባዊነት ለርሱን
 ተሰጥቶ የመደራጀት መብት በሚረዳው መንግስት መተካት ያስፈልጋል። ለምሳሌ፡ ሰራው
 ሕዝብ ለመደራጀት መብት ለመገንባት ሥልጣን ለመስጠት ለገደፖለቲካ ተረድተው፣
 ሕዝብ ለመደራጀት መብት ደርጉን ለመተካት የተነሳው እነዚህን ሁሉም የሚረዳው
 ገዢ ይህንኑ ነው። ዛሬ ሰራው ሕዝብ የመደራጀት መብት ለሕዝባዊነት የሚገኝ ረዳው
 ሳይወጣት ለመደራጀት የሚያስፈልገው ነገር የለም!! ከነሱ ጋር ተባብሮ ደርጉን ይጥ
 ለኛ እነርሱ ደርጉን ይተክላቸዋል። ለሰራው ሕዝብም በሌላ ለገንዘብ ሕዝባዊ መንግስት

መባር ተገልጦ የሌለውን ከፓለብ ተደራጅተው ማለት ባለው ገለል ይላሉታል!!

ጊዜያዊ መንግስት የሚለው ለውሃ ፀረክር እነዚህን መንግስት ሁሉ የሚታ
 ገለላት መረከር የሆነው በዚህም ሰዓት ደርጉን ለመተካት የሚችሉት እነሱ ወይም ለ
 ሰራዊታቸው ቦታ ለሆኑ ሰራው ሕዝብ ሳይዘጋጁና ሳይደረጁ ለፖለቲካ ድርጅቶች ሳይፈሩ መንግስት
 ሥልጣን ለመወጣት ለሰላምታ መረከር የነሱን ሥልጣን ሳይፈሩ መላሰብ ለሰላምታ ነው።

ይህን የሕዝብን ድካም ለመደራጀት ተገንብተው ያያቸው ለሰላምታ ለመንግስት
 ሥልጣን ሳይፈሩ መላሰብ በዘግቶ መንገድ የሚታገሉት የሕዝብ/ፈላጊነት መሪዎች
 የሕዝብ ጥንት የደርጉ ደጋፊነት ለገደፖለቲካ ለውጥ ያሉት። ገን ለኛ ከሞላ ግደል ሰብ
 ራው ሕዝብ ሳይ የሰናኖቹ ተገዛት ያህል ለምነት ሲኖራቸው የሕዝብ መላቸው ከባታቸው
 ገፈ ባተሱ ሰራው ሕዝብ ሳይደረጁ ለገዢ ነገ መቸ ሥልጣን ለይዘ ይቻላል። በሚል በባህ
 ተታለን የምናውቀው ገሃድ ሆኑ ለገዢው። በሰራው ሕዝብ የተደራጀ ያይላ ሳይ
 ለምነት ሰላላን የዛሬ ድካምን ሳይወጣቸውና ሳይዘጋጁና ሳይደረጁ መንግስት ሥልጣን ለይዘ
 ይቻላል የሚል ተለዋጭ ለገንባላን። ሰራው ሕዝብ እነዚህ መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመወጣት
 የገደሉትን ሁኔታዎች ለገደፖለቲካ ለውጥ ለውጥ ለውጥ ለውጥ ለውጥ ለውጥ
 ወገድ ለገንባላን። የደርጉን በእስላሞች መተካት ለሰላምታ ሰራው ሕዝብ ዛሬ
 ሥልጣን ለመወጣት ተቻላለህ በሚል ወገን የእስላሞችን ሥልጣን ሳይፈሩ መላሰብ ለገዢ
 ያገዝ ለገዢው። ደርጉ በሰራው ሕዝብ ለገዢነት ሰላምታ ሰራው የዛሬ ድካምን በገዢው
 ተናገረን ለውነተኛውን የራሱ መንግስት ለገንባ የሚችሉትን የተገል መንገድ ለገዢው
 ለባሕር ጊዜ ለገንባላን። በዚህ የመራ ለገዢው የደርጉ ደጋፊነታችን የሚታየው ካለ
 የራሱን የእስላሞች ወገን መንገዝ ሥልጣን ደጋፊነት ለመሸጋገን የሚገር ለውሃ ነው።

የማህበራቸውን ሥራ ለባሕር ሕዝባዊነት ለምና ባወጣው ለገዢ መንግስት
 'ዛሬ ከያለበት የሚሰነዘረት ሕዝባዊ መንግስት'፣ 'ጊዜያዊ መንግስት'፣ 'የጥንታዊ
 መንግስት' የሚሉት ሠራ ያሉት በዚህም ላይ ሊት ጥያቄ ሁኔታ ከአውነተኛው ሕዝባዊ መንግስት
 ጥን ያህል የተለዩ ለሆኑ የሚኖሩ ማሳየትና ወደባዊነታችን የምናደርገውን ረዝም ገዢ
 ለገዢውና ለሕዝባዊነት ነት ተገ መመከት ታሪክ የሚለብን ሃላፊነት ነው።

ይህን ሃላፊነታችንን መቀበል ሳይባላን የርቶ የሌላ ጥያቄ ሕዝብ
 ለሕግ ተገል በአገደዚህ ዓይነት ያሉት ተደናገሮ ተጥቶ ሲታገዝ የእነዚህን ሠራ ያሉት
 ጥንነት ሳይሰረዝው የርቶ የሌላ ጥያቄ ሕዝብ ዛሬ የተገለገለ ለመራር በያዙት በገዢው

2. ወታደራዊ የሕግ ሥልጣን በጥቅም ላይ የዘጋገበው የሕግ ምክር ቤት የሚታገሉት የግዕዝ ከብር ጭነት በፍላጎት ሕዝባዊ መንግስት ሲሉ የዚህን መሬት ምዝገባና ለገጽ ጥላቻ ይህንን ባለመላው ግዕዝ ከብር ትኩረት በሰጧል ግዕዝ ከብር ትኩረት የሚታደር መንግስት ሠርቶ ለደራሱ መንግስት የሚታገል ለገጽ ምክር ቤት ጥላቻ ነው፡፡

3. በላይ እንደጠቀስነው የወታደር ፀረ ሕዝብ ግብዓትና የገንጥ አይነት ጊዜያዊ ጦን ገብተው አጣባቢነት ጥበቃውንም አይቻልም፡፡ ይህ ባሁኑ ጊዜ ተደጋግቶ ጦንታው ያለበት ሀቀ ሆኖ ባለፈውናት ሄው ጊዜያዊ ጦንገብ ሊሆን እንደሚችል አድርጎ ጭረብ ወዟል፤ አርባአደራገጠውታደራ ፀረ ሀዘብ ግብዓትና ሊያደግ የሚችለውን የተደራጀ የጦር ያይላ የሚያቋቁሙትን የተገላ ጌገና አበተቸ የዚህንም አባረላጌነት አባረብቶ /ፍላጎት መናት ሂሳብ/ ሊሰራ የገባበት ከበርቱ ጦንገብ እንዲታገሉ ጭረገ ነው፡፡

• • • • •

የወታደራዊ የሥልጣን ጭናጥ መስበር የሚታወቅ ሕዝቡ ጭክሩን ማቆም ሊያገኙና ሊያስብሩ የሚችሉ አገላገሎች አገደሜላት በገጠማዊነት ጋዜጃዊ መገንባት አማካይነት አይደለም፡፡ ሕዝቡ ለመብቱ ለጥቅሙ ፡፡ ከታች በሚያደርገው የራሱ የማይቋረጥ ተገልጦት አማካይነት በገጽ 14፡፡

1967/XXXX

በተገባቸው ቁጥር 2 1967/ለአገባቤ ደብዳቤ በተሰጠ ወሰን.../

• • •

የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝቦች ተገል ስህን ባለባት ደረጃ ይህ የጊዜያዊ ጭገር ጥያቄ
 ሙሉ በሙሉ ባለባቸው ነበር። በየትኛውም ስር በየትኛውም ጊዜ የተወሰኑ ጭገሮች ያለ
 ፖለቲካ ፓርቲ በጭን ድርጅቶች ለጥቂት ነገሮች ለመገንባት ሥልጣን/ጊዜያዊ ሆኖ ይህ/ፓለቲካ
 አያውቅም። በኢትዮጵያ የተወሰኑ ጭገሮች የፖለቲካ ድርጅቶች ባይኖሩ በተለይ የኢትዮ
 ስያ ረዝላለግ የድል የባለባት የሆነው የወዘደረጃ ፓርቲ ገና ባይፈጠር ለጊዜያዊ ጭገር
 ሙሉ በሙሉ በጥያቄው ውስጥ ባለባቸው ነበር። ከፈረሱ ጋራው ለይተዋል። የፖለቲካ ሥልጣን
 ለመወጣት የሚደረገው ተገል ከፖለቲካ ፓርቲ የዲሞክራሲ ስር። ነገር ገን ጥያቄው በገጠላ
 ከበርህው ልዩ ልዩ ክፍሎች ሙሉ በሙሉ ከሰላም በላይ ለሰላም በሰላም በሰላም በሰላም በሰላም
 ሆኖ ለሰላም በሰላም ያቸ የተነሳ በሰላም ሙሉ ያለ ስህተት ነገር ያለገን አያውቅም ይገ
 ሙሉ ገልጻል።

ገና. በኛ አጽነት የተረጋገጠ የረገጠናው ያለ /አጣጣል/ ተገባር መደራጀትና ማደራጀት ነው። ይህ ጉዳይ የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝቦች ተገባር በአገራችን ላይ በረጅም ጊዜ ሲጠራው ለቀጣዩ ወደፊት መጥፋት አለመጥፋትን የሚያረጋግጥ ከፍተኛ ጥያቄ ነው። ይህንን በጣሙን የተረጋገጠ ማደራጀት ከዚህ አጣጣል ጥያቄ ከሰላላ በፍጹም ሕዝባዊነት ሊፈረግ ሊጠየቅ የገጠነ ከበርቱ መንግስት በመታገል ጊዜና ገጠታዊነትን አንዲያወጥሰው የሚቀበሉበትን ይህን መሪ ያለ አጋልጠን የተገሉ የፍ ጥሪ መደራጀትና ማደራጀት አንደሆነ የጣሚ የተፈሰሰው ሕዝብ ለመብቱ ለጥቅሙ የሚጠላትን መንግስት በአፈጻጸሙ ሲይህን በተደራጀ የረገጠ ጊዜ ተገባር በኋላ በገጥሞ ሊያገኘው አንደሚችል የጣሚ ገጥሞ ላለብን በመረጋገጥ ነው።

25. የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝቦች ለነፃነታቸው የሚያደርጉት ተገባ ረጅምና ጭነት ነው፡፡ በፊት ሕዝቡ ከላላው ተገባ ጭነት ሥለሆነ በኋላ ሲገባ አይቻልም፡፡ በኢትዮጵያ ሞከራሲያዊ ስርዐት ሊገነባ የሚችለው በፊደላዊና በሥነ ምግባር መቃብር ላይ በፓ ነው፡፡ እነዚህን ሁሉ ሀብቶች በነባራዊ ሁኔታ/አብደክቷለ/በመካፈል ወይም ለግብዓት በመቃብር 'ጊዜያዊ ሕዝባዊ መንግስት' ባደገ ፊደላዊና ሥነ ምግባር ላይ ይመሰረቱ በነዚህ የሕዝቡ ጥገና መሳቸ የተገነቡት ሲከራሲፕ የፖለቲካና የጠር ጋይሰ ሳይከራሲፕ ሳይከራሲፕ የሆነ መንግስት ወይም ሞከራሲያዊ ስርዐት ሊቀም አንደኛውን አርገው መሪ ታላቸውን ሲያተርቡ ይህ መዘለል ከግብዓቱ እውነተኛ የኢትዮጵያ ረገድ/ጥን አካል አንደኛውን ያደርጋል ማሳየት የተገባ ደርገኝ ቸን መሆኑን በመገንዘብ ነው፡፡

ለሁሉም ሲሆን ይህን መሪ ያለ ያነሱ ገን ለዘላቂው ረዝላዝን የሕመ
ተራማጆች ሥህተት መሆኑን ተረድተው እንዲያስተና ለመደራደርና ለሕመምተኛው ሰላምና ሰላም
ተገለ ላይ ብቻ እንዲያተኩሩ ለማድረግ በመታገል እንጠይቃለን፡፡

ከኢትዮጵያ ሕዝቦች የ11 ወራት ተገላ የምገጃረው የሕዝባችን ተገላ
ድካም አለመደራጀት መሆኑን ነው፡፡ ወዘደረገና ሰፊውን ሕዝብ ህገ ተገላ የሚመራ የወ
ዘደረ ፓርቲ የለም፡፡ ፊውላሊዝምና ኢምፔሪያሊዝም የሚዋጉ ሌሎች መደቦችና የሕብረ
ተሰብ ክፍሎች ገና አላተደራጁም፡፡ አሁን የሚገኘው ሥልጣን ሙሉም መጠነና የሆኑትን
ሕዝብ ህገ መንግሥት አገዛዝ ደርጎ ሌገና የፓለቲካ ጉዞዎች መገንባት ባለው ደህንነት ባይሆን
ሰፊው ቁጥጥር ሕዝብ በላላተደራጀ ነው፡፡ ያለደርጅት ሕዝቡ ምንም አይገኝም፡፡

ወደአውነተኛ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ወደአውነተኛ ሕዝብ ሥርዐት የሚወስድ
 ውጥ ጉዳዩ የምንደዘው በቅጣት አጥባቂነት ሳይሆን በአካሉ ሕዝብ ሥርዐት ሊገለጽ
 ብቻ ነው። ዋና ሃሳዱ ነታቸው የሕዝቡን ተገባ በዚህ ሥርዐት አቅጣጫ ወደፊት ለማራወድ
 ወታታል ነው። ስርዐቱ አሁን በደረሰበት ደረጃ የሕዝቡን ተገባ ወደፊት ለማራወድ ወታ
 ታል ዓለት አራባት ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ነው። ዛሬ
 ለዚህ ሥርዐት ወዘጋጀትና ወዘጋጀት ዓለት ደገፍ ለሕዝባዊ የሚደረገው ተገባ እንዲ
 44 ዓመት ተገባ በዚህ ተገባ ውስጥ እየተደራጁ ማደራጀት ዓለት ነው። ለኢትዮጵያ ሕዝ
 ባቸው ሕዝባዊ ለማባባት ከአካሉ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ
 አርሱን የሚታይ አቋቁ ወረራን ተገባን ለማድናዊ እንዲ ለሌላ አይደለም። ይህ ሀቀ
 ለሁሉም ተራማጆች ገለጽ እንዲሆን ያስፈልጋል።

ለሕዝባዊ የሚደረገው ተገባ ደፋፋ

ተራማጆች ተደራጁ አይረጁ

/ሐዳር 1967/

xxxxxxxx

በተገባቸው ዘና ቀን 2 1967 /ርዕስ አንቀጽ/

አገልግሎት ያደረጉት ቀዝተ ተቀረ ሁሉም የሰፊው ሕዝብ የተገባ ወገድ ለዘጋጅ

የገባቸውን ሥርዐት ያናጋው የመጨረሻው የሕዝብ የተገባ ወገድ ለሰፊ
 ሁሉም ኩነቶች ተከትሎ መግባቱን በማስተባበል ላይ ይገኛል። ሰፊው ሕዝብ ያለፈትን
 ወራት ተገባ ልምድ እየደቀነና ራሱን ተራማጆችን እየተሰማረከ በማድረግና ለመ
 ጨዋ ገጥሟል። በሰፊው ሕዝብ ላይ ነው። በሌላ አነጋገር አሁንም ቢሆን በኢትዮጵያ
 አብዮታዊ ሁኔታ እንዳንበራራ ነው። በዚህ አገጣጣሪ ተራማጆች በዚህ የፖለቲካ ገጽ ተነ
 በተሰጡ ክርሱ ጋር ተጠቃሚ የሆኑ ታሪካዊ መተላለፍ የሕዝቡን ሥርዐትና የተገባ ወገ
 ፊት ለማራወድ ተገቢ ወራት ያሉትን መመሪያ ይኖርባቸዋል። ዓለትም ለመጨረሻ ገጥሟ
 የሕዝቡን የፖለቲካ ገጽ አይደለም ከፍ ለማድረግና ተገባ ለማዘጋጀት የተገባውን የሕ
 ዝብ ተገባ ለታዋቂና አይረጁት በሕዝብ ጠላቶች ሌላ ተራማጆች የሰፊው ሕዝብ እንዲ
 ሆን ለማድረግ ከመቼውም ጊዜ ይበልጥ ዛሬ መጣር አለባቸው። ይህን ተገባር በሚገባ
 ለማከናወን የሚችሉት ከአገላገሉ አካባቢያዊ የሚፈልቁትን በምናት ሆነ/እና በቀዝተ ላይ
 የተመረከተ የፖለቲካ አስተያየቶች ወዲያ ጥለው በተጨማሪ የሕዝብ ተገባ ለመጥሃድ
 ሲችሉ ብቻ ነው።

ቀዝታዊ ከምንላቸው አስተሳሰቦች እንዳንደገፍ ከገጠን ከበር ሕዝብ አካባቢ የሚሰነዝ
 ዘረት አገደ ጊዜያዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል። አገደ ጊዜያዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል። አገደ ጊዜያዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል።
 ሰለት ናቸው። በዚህ በፊት ደጋገፎን እንዳስረዳነው በኢትዮጵያ ውስጥ ባሁኑ ጊዜ ሕገ
 መንግሥታዊ አቀፎ፣ ሕዝባዊ/ዲሞክራሲያዊ ሆኖ ጊዜያዊ/ወገንነት የሕዝቡን ተገባ ወደፊት የሚያ
 ራዎት ወራት ያላት አይደለም። ለምሳሌ ያለዘጋጅ ራዎት ሕዝቡን ጥቅም መብት
 የሚያስጠብቅ ወገንነት ሊኖር አይችልም። ይህ ከሌላ ጥቅም ሕዝባዊ የተገባ ታሪክ የጥሰ
 ምነቱ ተራማጆች ብቻ ሳይሆን ያለፈት ወራት ያገራቸውን ጥቅም ሕዝብ ታሪክ ይሆን ይመስ
 ከራሱ። በታላቅ ተጋድሎ የተገኘት የሕዝብ ነፃነቱን እንሆ ተገባ ያል። በመገፈፍም ላይ
 ናቸው። ይህም የሚያሳየን የገባቸውን በርዕዮትና ለምሳሌ ያለዘጋጅ በሕዝቡ ነፃነቱን ያር
 ፈጽሞ ሊገኝልን ባንድ ጣራ ሥር ሊኖሩ እንደማይችሉ ነው። አንቀጽ ሌላውን የገደባችን
 ገደ አለበት።

እነዚህ የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝባዊ ጥገዳ ጠላቶች ለገሉ ሕዝቡ የተወጣጡ
 ጊዜያዊ ወገንነት ሕዝባዊ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል። የሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል። የሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ይቆያል።
 መኖር የማይችሉ ነገሮች/የሕዝቡን ነፃነትና ወደፊት በርዕዮት/ለማስተባበር የሚቀርብ ጥራዝ
 ነጠቀነት ነው። በፍ አምነት በኢትዮጵያ ውስጥ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ሆነ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት
 ወገንነት ሊኖሩ የሚችሉት ለምሳሌ ያለዘጋጅ ራዎት ሕዝቡን የጠር ተገባ ደብ ለመተ
 ብቻ ነው።

የዚህ ጊዜያዊ ወገንነት ተገባር ተገባ ሲተረጎም ለሕዝቡ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት
 መብቶች መስጠትና ሕዝባዊ/ፖለቲካ/የሕዝባዊ ወገንነት ማስመረጥ ነው ይባላል። ነገር ገን
 ለሕዝቡ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት መብቶች መስጠት ዓለት ምን ዓለት ነው። ነፃነት ወገን ጊዜ ቢሆን
 አገደ መና ከሰማይ ጥብብ ለምሳሌ አይደለም። ለሕዝቡ ሕዝባዊ ወገንነት መብቶች መስጠት ዓለት
 የሚመቀኑትን ነፃነትን የነፈጉትን የሕዝቡን ነፃ መወጣት የሚባረሩ ያይሆን ለምሳሌ ያለዘጋጅ
 ሕዝቡንና ራዎት ሕዝቡን - መስጠት ዓለት ነው። በሌላ አነጋገር ለሕዝቡ ነፃነት መስ
 ጠት ዓለት በሕዝቡ ባርነት የተኖረ የሕዝባዊ ጥቅም ያላቸውን መደቦች ከምድር ገጽ ማጥ
 ፋት ዓለት ነው። ለሕዝቡ ነፃነት ማገኘት ሌላ ወገን ሕዝባዊ ሌላ ተርጉም ሊጠቀስ
 አይችልም። የሕዝቡ ነፃነት መተላለፍ ዓለት የጠላቶች መወገድ ዓለት ነው።

በቲያሪ መልክ የርቶ አስተ ነገረን በገቢር/ገራክክ/ደረጃ እንመለከተው።
 ለበገት ዓመታት ሕዝቡን ሲገባና ሲዘርፍ የኖረው ያበጠ ሕዝባዊ የሕዝቡን ነፃነት
 ያስጠራል የሚል ማን ለሌላ ሕዝቡን እንዳውራ ያደገ የነበረው ሠራዊት ባሁኑ ጊዜ

3. የገዢው ስም ገገሰ ገገሰ

በጣቲ ሕዝባዊ ለገዛገባ ወላ በበዙ ተፈጻሚ ሊቅ የሚሆን ዘንድ
ተወሰኑት ያተረፈ ጠፊ ያለ ሲኖር ይህ 'ጊዜያዊ ሕዝባዊ ጠገን' የሚባለው ነው፡፡
ወዲያው ያሉት የጥገና ማህበራት /አገላለጽ የአጭር ተርጓሚ ማህበራት ጥያቄ/ሲቀበሉት
ያጭር ማህበር በ145ው ስ/ገዛገባ ላይ ውይይት ለደርገውታል፡፡ ከዚያም ወላ ጠፊ
ያሉ ደጋፊያቸው ስለሚከተሉት ባሰሩት የበለጸጉ የገንዘብ ማህበር ጠገን
ለባይተዋል በገላገሉ ስህተት ለይሆንዋል፡፡

በፀሐይ ስር ያሉት ጤና ያሉ ደጋፊዎች የዚህን 'ልዝባዊ' ግንኙነት ለማስተካከል የሚችሉትን ሁሉም ዘዴዎችን ይጠቀማሉ። በዓለቱ ይላቸውትን ጥያቄዎች በተጨማሪም ለሌሎች ለሚገኙት ሰራተኛዎች ይገልጻሉ። ይህም ማለት የሚችልበት ሁኔታ ሲሆን፡፡ 'የፎርፓላሽን' ሰራተኛዎች ለሰራተኛዎች የሚሰጡት ጥላቻ ለሰራተኛዎች ይከፈላል። ለዚህም የፎርፓላሽን ይህን ጥላቻ ያስተላለፉ ደረጃ ለሰራተኛዎች ይዘገባል። ለሰራተኛዎች ይህም ማለት የሚችልበት ሁኔታ ሲሆን፡፡ የሰራተኛዎች ምርብ በዚህ ስርዓት ይገኛል። ለሰራተኛዎች ይህም ማለት የሚችልበት ሁኔታ ሲሆን፡፡ የሰራተኛዎች ምርብ በዚህ ስርዓት ይገኛል። ለሰራተኛዎች ይህም ማለት የሚችልበት ሁኔታ ሲሆን፡፡ የሰራተኛዎች ምርብ በዚህ ስርዓት ይገኛል።

የፖለቲካ ተገልጽ የዓረብ ጥያቄን ለየተ አርጉ የጤናው ጣህበረሰቡን ንግ
በዚህ ሁሉ ስለተደናገዘው :: የዓረብ ጥያቄ በሀተናነትና ለተገለጸን ለገደጣችን በጤና
አስተሳሰብ :: ይህን ፀረሪፋሎችና ፀረ ምርጫና የደርግን ፀረ ጥበቃውን ለገዛ
ወይም በጣም የተለያዩ ነገሮች ወይም በሰላም ለባይቷ ::

[illegible]

ጠፊ ያሉ የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝቦች በተለይ የወዘአደረፍ የበሬው አርባአደር ጥያቄ አይደለም፡፡ እነዚህ ወይቦች በአገራችን የግንባታ ሥራ ላይ ወይም ለሀገራችን የሚታወቁ ደረጃ አሳደረቡ፡፡ በነሱ ሰጡ የግንባታ ሥራ የሚደረግ ድርጅት በሰላላ የታወቀ ለነሱ የጥያቄ አገደባቸው ጥያቄ ሰጥቶ አገዛዝ፡፡ ወዘአደረፍ ያለገር ሕግ ሥራ የሚደረግበት ወይም የሚረጋገጥበት ለላይ ወይም የሰላላ፡፡/ለገን/፡፡ አርባ አደረፍ ደግሞ በወዘአደረፍ ገር ቲ በሚፈጸሙበት ሰርዓት በወዘአደረፍ ሀብት ላይ በ ተወሰነ የአገደባቸው ገንባር አስባላቸውበት ድረስ የግንባታ ሥራ ለሕዝቡ የሚታወቅ ድርጅት በሰላላ ይህ ጠፊ ያሉ በአርባአደረፍ ሰጡ ሰርዓት ለሚታወቅ፡፡ ባላቸው ከፈረሰ ጋራ አይታወቅም፡፡ የበሬው ግን ሕዝቡ ተገባ ወር ተ የግንባታ ሥራ ለሕዝቡ ድርጅት ላይኛ ሰራጭ ሕዝቡ የግንባታ ሥራ ለሕዝቡ ለሚታወቅ፡፡ ደግሞ የሚታወቅ የግንባታ ሥራ ለሕዝቡ ወይም ፈቃድ በሰላላ የሚሰጡ የወዘአደረፍ ወዘአደረፍ አርባ አደረፍ ያለገር ሕዝቡ ድርጅት ለሕዝቡ ለሚታወቅ፡፡ ሕዝቡ የግንባታ ሥራ ለሕዝቡ ለሚታወቅ፡፡

[illegible]

"Throughout February the leading ideology of the struggle was proletarian ideology. Its conscious promoters were earlier 1) The University Teachers association; later on, 2) the breaking away University Teachers Forum, 3) the university students union in Addis Ababa and the popular papers Democracia, the Voice of the People, etc." (Combat)

በነገሩት ላይ በለዘለዘረ አገር ተርቶ ለገደ የተረገ ወደብ ለፋ
- የዘለዘረ ወደብ፡፡ አጠገን ይሁን ገዳና ጭንጭን በዘለዘረ ርሳት ላለፉ የጭንጭን
አገዛዝ የተጣሩ የአባተጣፊ ጭንጭን በለዘለዘረ ወደብ ላይ የሚገኝ ሆኖ
የቀረበርሲት አባተጣፊ ጭንጭን የወደደ፡፡ ጭንጭን፡

በሰዓት ሰዓት በፍላጊ ግለተኛ ከሮ ኃይለፍገሠራቲው ግህበርፕፕሎድ ሀረግ
ግህበርፕፕሎድ ገንባት ደርጅቶና ከሀገር ወደ ሀገር በተሰራው ልዝ
ቡን በግጭቱ ለፍጥነት ሰዓት ደርገው ይገኛሉ፡፡.../ሞርክ የተሰራ፡፡/

[illegible]

10. ለገላለገ፡፡ በጭ የኢትዮጵያን ሕዝቦች በፋሽስታዊ ለገዝ የሚያድነው ለሕግ ሕግ
 ፈተካ ሪፖርተርና በወዘለደረ ወደባ የሚረዳ ሕዝባዊ ግንባታ ሰብረት በቻ ስለሆነ
 ሕዝቡን ለናታ፣ ለሕህድ ሪፖርተርና ለናዘጋጅው ለናደረገው ነው የገለጸው፡፡

በበተኛው የጠቅላይ ሚኒስትር አላዘዙ የሚሉ ጊዜያዊ ግንባታና ልንገልጽ
ጊዜያዊ ግንባታ አገልግሎት የሚሰጠው ነው፡፡ የፈረዘኑ ጠላት/የዘገጃርው/የሰገና
የሌሊን ለማወቅና ስላንገልጽ ይሆናል የግንባታን የሚያስፈልግ ለመጣጣን የሚያገለግል
ጊዜያዊ ግንባታ የሚሰጠው ስለ ብቻ የያዙ ጥቅሶች ለመደርደር ሊያጋለጥሩ ይችላሉ፡፡
የሀሳብ ማጠቃለያ ገን ሌሊን በሀገሪቱ ለሚገኙ የግንባታ የሚሰጠው የጋራ ስላሳገባ
በዚህ ላይ በይሆን ለኛ የሚጠቀሙ ጥቅሶች አሉ፡፡ እነዚህን ዘዴ በሌላ አካል ማግኘት፡፡
በጊዜ ስላንገልጽ አገልግሎት ይህ አገልግሎት ስላንገልጽ ለሚገኙ ይሆናል
በበጋው ለመገኘት አገልግሎት አገልግሎት ይላገጣል፡፡ በተጨማሪ ሌሊን በሀገሪቱ ለሚገኙ
ና የግንባታ የሚሰጠው ሁሉ እዚህ ማግኘት ለሚገኙ የዚህ ይሆናል አገልግሎት የሚገኝ
ለተገኘ የሌሊን ይሆናል በጊዜ ስላንገልጽ በሌላ አካል ማግኘት፡፡

1. Social democracy and the Provisional Revolutionary Government.
2. The Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.
3. The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.
4. The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government.
(All in Lenin, Collected Works Vol. 8 .Moscow 1962)
1. Two tactic of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution
2. The Boycott of the Bulyigin Duma and insurrection
3. No falsehood! Our strength lies in stating the truth!
(All in Lenin, C.W. Vol. 9)

ከደመረታል አገገድ ለዘተ ለመጠየቅ፡፡ የሰላም ጭንቀት ማግኘት ግዴታ
ሕዝባዊ፡፡ የሰላም ማግኘት ግዴታ ረቀቅናል፡፡ ነበር፡፡ የገደቡ የራሴን ጭንቀት
አደር የራሱ ገር ሂ/ያውን በሰላም የሚረዳ/ነበረው፡፡ የሁሉንም ጭንቀት የራሱ ገር ሂ
የለውም፡፡ ከአባቱ የገደቡ ማህበረ አገሪቱ የሚረዳው ማግኘት በተሻለው ገደቡ ከበር ሂ/ያ
ነው፡፡ የዚያን ግዴታ ረቀቅናል የረቀቅናል አገሪቱ ማህበረ የገሪቱን ገር ሂ/ያ
ደርድሮ ነበር፡፡ በሁሉንም ሰላም ገደቡ የሚረዳው የገደቡ የለውም፡፡ የገደቡ
ከበር ሂ/ያ የሚረዳው አገሪቱ በገሪቱ ላይ ያለውን ጭንቀት ሂ/ያ፡፡

በዚ መገባት አዳጋ ላይ ለቆየት አለ፡፡ ስራው የሀገጅ 'ላቦለይር' የደብዳቤ የባለፍጅ የራሴን ወዛይር ጋር ተገንጥሎ ወጣና አገሩን ይላለ፡፡

[illegible][illegible]

28

29

ሊኖር ውስጥ የሚከሰቱትን ነገሮች በአዋቂነት ሥልጣን ላይ ወጣች በዚያ ወጪ ወረ ሞከረ ትኩረት በሆነ መንገድ ይገዛል፡፡ በአዚህ አሁኑኑ ወርዶ በ'ሕዝባዊ' መንግስት አገዳሽ ስልጣን ሥልጣን ላይ አገዳሪ መገፋቱ ነው የሚለው፡፡

የዋነኑትን በረሕባዊ አገልግሎት የተደገፉ ገዢዎችን የሥልጣን ገንባት ሥልጣን በረሕባዊ አገልግሎት ያሳስባቸው በረሕባዊ መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመያዝ ያልተዘጋጀና ያልተደራጀ በላብረ ነው፡፡ ዛሬም ቢሆን የረሕባዊው ያህል ደርጉ አገዳ ወደቀለን በገጣሚነት በረሕባዊ መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመያዝ አስባላቸውና አስባላቸው ደረሰ ደርጉን ከመንግስት ሥልጣን ሊቀል ይቆያል፡፡ ደርጉ አገዳ የደብዳቤ በበረሕባዊ መንግስት ተገልጦ በረሕባዊ አገልግሎት የሕትመት ሕዝባዊ መንግስት ሥልጣን አስባ ለተዘጋጁ አስባላቸው ደረሰ መንግስት ሥልጣን አገዳ በወተደረ የተደገፈ አገዳ ለደባባሪነት በረሕባዊ አገዳ በረሕባዊ መንግስት ሥልጣን ላይ ያለመሰላል መውጣት የማይቻለውን ያህል ያለፈለገው ደርጉ በረሕባዊ መንግስት ሥልጣን ላይ ለወጣ ይቆያል፡፡

አገዳን ገብረ አገዳ ያሳሉ አገዳ፡፡ ለህል ለጥራትና ከጥገራ ለመውጣት ይረዳል፡፡ መረተ አገዳ አገዳና ጥገራ ገን የለውም፡፡ በዚህ ሁኔታ በተገኘ ጥገራውን ያዘጋጁና አርባውን ወደመር ይቆያል፡፡ ጥገራውን ሲያዘጋጁ ገን 'አርባ' የይዘው ብሉ ባይ ይበክር አወደርገው፡፡ በዚህ ያሳሉ ጥገራውን ለገብረው ያለውን ተርጉም ያህል የፖለቲካ ደርጉዎች ለበረሕባዊ መንግስት አስረዳኝ ነው፡፡ ስለዚህ መባራት መንግስት ሥልጣን ለመያዝ ደርቦ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ በአዚህ ወደደገፍ መሳገፍ ይህ የፖለቲካ ደርጉ ተረፎ ሕዝቡን ለመንግስት ሥልጣን አስባላቸው ደረሰ ደርጉ ይገዛል፡፡ መንግስት ሥልጣን በረሕባዊ መንግስት አገዳ ሲሆን ዛሬ ጥገራውን የሚቆጣጠር ጥገራውን ያለበት ይህን መንግስት ሥልጣን መወጣት መባራት ወደመር ነው፡፡ ጥላቻ ለሆነ የሕትመት ተረፎች አጣፋ ተገባር መፈራትና ጥገራው ነው፡፡ 'ዚያዊ መንግስት' አገዳ የሚሆኑ ተደርገው ፋብሪካ አገዳ የደርጉ ደጋፊዎች አገዳ በመባደን ለመርባት ነው አገዳ ደርጉን ሊያደግፍ በመወረደው ሊቀል የሚቆጣጠር የተደራጀ ሕዝባዊ ያይላ ባይ ለሆነ አገዳ ሚቀል መረተ ይህን ያህል የሚከባባሱ አይመስሉም፡፡ 'ደርጉ አገዳ ይወድያል' የሚለው የጥያቄ ለረጠ አቅርቦ መለሱን በተወሰነ መንገድ ይረዳል፡፡

አዚህ ላይ አገዳ የታሪክ ያሳሉ በገጣሚነት ነገሩን በበለጠ ያስረዳል፡፡ በዋነኑት 1917 የረሕባዊ በረሕባዊ ታሪክ ተገደሉ ባይ ረሳቸው የነገሩ መንግስት

ይወድያል፡፡ ለኒን አገዳሪዎች የወደረገ ፓርቲ ሕዝቡን በጥንቃቄ ለላላደረገውና ለላላዘጋጀው የረሕባዊነት ያይላቸው በጥንቃቄ ለላላ ተመናክረው መንግስት ሥልጣን በበረሕባዊ መንግስት አገዳ /ጥላቻ ወደረገና ይህ ገብረው አገዳ/ሳይሆን በከበር ነው አገዳ ይወድያል፡፡ ከከበር ነው 'ዚያዊ መንግስት' ይመስላል፡፡ ይህ የከበር ነው ዚያዊ መንግስት ፍጹም ፀረ አብዮታዊ ነው፡፡ ለኒን አገዳሪ ወደረገ ሊያስር ያሳድራል ነው፡፡ /አደር ባይቸ ለባ ጥላቸው ይህን የሊኒን ለመገደል ይረዳል ያነሳው የሚረዳል የፖለቲካ ጥያቄ አገዳሪ ለጥያቄ ለናስታወቁት ነው፡፡ /ኒን በረሕባዊ ወደረገ ፓርቲ ለሕዝባዊ ከጥላቻ ለሕዝባዊ ነው የሚታለው በረሕባዊ የጥንቃቄነት ወጣት አገዳሪ ያደርጋል፡፡

"The slogan 'down with the Provisional Government' is an incorrect one at the present moment because, in the absence of a solid (i.e., a class-conscious and organized) majority of the people on the side of the revolutionary proletariat, such a slogan is either an empty phrase, or, objectively, amounts to attempts of adventurist character.

"We shall favour the transfer of power to the proletarians and semi-proletarians only when the Soviets of workers' and Soldiers' Deputies adopt our policy... (Lenin, C.W. Vol 24 p.216-11. Our Emphasis)

ኒን የዚህን መንግስት መውጣት ባይረዳል ተርቶ አገዳሪነት ይደገፍ ይህን መንግስት ለላላደገና ለላላህነት በው ያለውን አገዳሪነት ለጥገራ ያለመከራደ ለጥገራ ያላቸው የላላደገና አገዳሪዎች አገዳ ገለጽ ይመስላል፡፡ ሥልጣን በረሕባዊ መንግስት አገዳ የሚገባበት ሁኔታ ባይሆን 'ሥልጣን ለበረሕባዊ መንግስት አሁኑኑ ባይ ጥገራውን ሊቀጥናቸው በላብረ ነው፡፡ በአዚህም የዚህ ጥገራውን ተገባር 'ሥልጣን ለበረሕባዊ መንግስት አሁኑኑ' አገዳ መወጣት ባይሆን ይህ ሁኔታ አገዳሪነት ሊቀጥናቸው ሥልጣን በረሕባዊ መንግስት አገዳ የሚገባበት ሁኔታ አገዳሪነት ተገለጽ መቀመጥ አገዳሪነት በጥንቃቄ አገዳ ይላል፡፡ የዚህ ጥገራውን በላብረና ብሉ ከመቀጣት አረተ ነጥቦች ሁኔታ የከበር ነው ዚያዊ መንግስትና ሊቀጥናቸው የከተሉ አደርባቸው ጥገራው መሆኑን ባይ ባይገባ፡፡

"...(3) To carry out propaganda and agitation from group to group in every regiment, in every factory,... (4) To organize, organize, and once more organize the proletariat, in every factory, in every district and in every city quarter." (ibid. Lenin's emphasis)

ጊዜያዊ ሕዝባዊ መንግስት ይቆያል፡፡ የሚለው አድሃሪ መፈሰር የሕዝቡን ተጥቶ የሚያስፈታ በመሆኑ ግህበራዊ ከመጀመሪያውም ሲታገለግል ሲያጋለጠው የይታለ፡፡

ምክንያቱ፡-

ሀ. ጊዜያዊ ሕዝባዊ መንግስት የሚባለው በመደብ ይዘት የሲርድ ከበር ፍጽ ማሳተፍ መንግስት አገዲ የሰፊው ዋና ሕዝብ ስላሳሳህነ፤

ለ. ለምሳሌ ያህኑ የግልጽ በርዕዮተ በሕዝባዊ አመጽ ለበባለተደመሰሱ ድረስ ግና ጥሎ ምን ዓይነት ሕዝባዊ መንግስት ሊታዩ ውስጥ ሊኖር ስለማይችል፤

ሐ. ጊዜያዊ ሕዝባዊ መንግስት አገደሚባለለት ለሕዝቡ ማከራሪ ሊሆን አይችልም፡፡ ማከራሪ ለሕዝቡ የሚሆን ነገር ባይሆን የሚታዩ ሕዝባዊ አገጥሰኝ ለገገኝ የው የአብዓታዊ ትገል ውጤት ብቻ በመሆኑ፤

መ. ሕዝባዊ መንግስት የሚገኘው በአብዓታዊ የጦር ትገል አገዲ በምርጫ ስላሳሳህነ ነው፡፡ በኛ ለምነት የጊዜው ተገባር ሕዝቡን ለአብዓታዊ ጦር አገዲ ለምርጫ ማዘጋጀት አይደለም፡፡

ግህበራዊን ወደፊት በበለጠ የዚህን መፈሰር አድሃሪነት ማጋለጥ ይኖርበታል፡፡ በዚህ መፈሰር የተደለሉትን ሀገራዊ ተራዎች ተገንዝተው በተሰጡት አብዓታዊ መንገድ የዚህን መፈሰር አድሃሪነት ማባዛት ያስፈልጋል፡፡ ሆኖም በሕሊናና በገጠር የሌላ የዓለም ሕዝብ ጠላቶች የሆኑትን ግዛታዊ የብርሃን መንግስት ይቆያል፡፡ የሚሉትን የሕዝብ/ፈላጊነት መሪዎች ያለርሀራሪ መታገል ያስፈልጋል፡፡

/ህሴ 1967/

—x+x+x+—

ከተገለጸን ዘና ቁጥር 1 1967

In Ethiopia it is presently a time when reactionaries, opportunists, reformists and deluded progressives call for a people's government. Under such a situation, it is our task to clearly show the true meaning of this slogan, characterize and concretize its revolutionary content. Those who bitterly opposed this slogan only yesterday are forced today to at least pay lip service to it, - to recognize it. But, in reality, they will never cease to make a hollow phrase out of it, to turn it into a simple harmless phrase. The acher guzoists and "federation partisans" are doing the same in their own way.

This right-opportunist wing in our movement, has been quite beyond itself in calling for the establishment of a care-taker government constituted out of 'representatives' of the different sections and classes of the population. The main function of this government, we are told, is "to prepare and conduct the election of a 'peoples government'".

A people's government is the government of the broad masses. It means that real sovereign power lies in the hands of the masses and that feudalism and imperialism no longer determine the destiny of Ethiopia. It presupposes that the broad masses enjoy the fullest democratic liberties and are directly involved in the administration of their state affairs. In other words, a people's government is nothing but the democratic dictatorship of the broad masses.

How can such a government come into being? Can we ever have the democratic dictatorship of the people through elections, given the fact that the laboring masses have not yet been organized, our opportunists must have thought about the question as to whom the masses would elect and what kind

of election would be possible under the circumstances prevailing in Ethiopia now. But let us go over and present our basic objections to this caretakerist theory, which, by the way, reproduces the position of the Mensheviks during the 1905 Russian Revolution.

Firstly, how can such elections differ from those already organized from above by the ruling classes to their own advantage?

Secondly, who would expect the feudo-capitalist bureaucracy to remain impartial during the elections? It is our firm belief that, so long as imperialism and feudalism have the upper hand in our country, to expect that they would tolerate the full freedom of speech, press, organization and agitation necessary for such an election, is at best naive, at worst counter-revolutionary. More over, to try to make the people believe that there can be a peoples government before the overthrow of feudalism and imperialism is to play into the hands of the enemy.

Thirdly, only opportunists would think of calling upon the masses to go to the polls during revolutionary periods. To call upon the masses to go to the polls, so that they be immersed in the election campaigns, is to distract them from their immediate revolutionary tasks - this is a well-known method of all opportunists in all countries. For instance, the right social democrats in Germany were able to strangle the November revolution in 1918, in that they succeeded to distract the working class from its revolutionary tasks by calling for elections. At a time, when the masses are taking historical actions and are engaged in developing and mastering different forms of struggle, to subsume these activities under a single form of struggle, the parliamentary form of struggle - a form of struggle which loses its validity in revolutionary situations - is down-right reactionary.

We must be vigilant and thoroughly expose such opportunist slogans, lest they be obstacles to our protracted and hard path to liberation. If we fail to live up to this responsibility, and should the heroic struggle of our peoples be disarmed by such confusing slogans because we have been unable

to explain the incorrectness, onesidedness and limitations of these slogans, and should the heroic peoples of Ethiopia be deceived by these slogans and enable the petty-bourgeois to maintain its present leadership because we were unable to show the masses the correct road to their liberation, this would amount to an unpardonable opportunism on our part and we will not escape the condemnation by history and the coming generations.

In order to live up to our tasks, it has to be our primary objective to assist the people's movement, unite and consolidate its forces and agitate now more than ever for the creation of revolutionary organizations and the working class party that alone is able to lead the masses in the correct path of struggle. We have to make it clear, for ourselves as well as for the masses that the only guarantee that the Ethiopian peoples will be able to form their own government and determine their own destiny is their political consciousness, organization and struggle. It is therefore necessary that the struggle be intensified, the movement be organized and pushed forward, and the level of consciousness be raised.

After explaining the incorrectness of these slogans, it is the task of revolutionaries to chart out the path of struggle towards the elimination of feudalism and imperialism in Ethiopia. The determination of this path should be based on an analysis of the prevailing concrete conditions in Ethiopia, and not on our subjective estimations and wishes.

THE QUESTION OF A PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT - HISTORICAL EXPERIENCES

It's of paramount importance that Ethiopian revolutionaries evaluate, sum up and learn from the store of experiences of the history of the world working class and national liberation movements in determining their tactics and strategies. Not only to avoid repeating mistakes, but also to get acquainted with the different aspects of the tactics and strategies in question, and be in a better position to deal with them.

In this article, we intend to deal with and analyze the experiences of the different revolutionary movements in the world regarding the question of a "peoples' government". This task is extremely important, not only in view of the fact that it enables us to attain clarity on this crucial issue of the Ethiopian revolution, but also serves as a battering ram to smash the counter-revolutionary arguments given by the ESUNA/Federation renegades and their like for the so-called "provisional popular government".

In dealing with the question of a given state and / or government, the main difference between a marxist and bourgeois analysis is that while Marxism seeks to bring to light its class nature, bourgeois social science seeks to mystify it. It's not without reason that bourgeois social science uses abstract phrases like democratic state, popular state, totalitarian state, etc... to characterise the different types of state and hereby obscure the class essence of these states. A marxist analysis, on the other hand, digs deeper and tries to show precisely the class content of a given state, as the central element of the political relationships within a given socio-economic formation - as the decisive organ of power and oppression in the hands of the ruling class.

Let's try to elucidate the differences of bourgeois social science and marxist analysis by using the example of a 'peoples' government. For example for bourgeois social science and politicians, the classical example of a people's government is the government of America. After all, argue the bourgeois apologists, the american government "is a government of the people, by the people, for the people". On the other hand, a marxist analysing the american government, would find out that it in reality expresses the power of money, as Lenin said, and is based on corruption, deception, etc... - manifests the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore in discussing the question of a people's government it's necessary from the viewpoint of Marxism, to analyze its class nature - that means, to peel out its class content. The whole point centers around the class meaning of the word "people". Unless that is specified, there is lots of room for confusion and mystification. For not only marxists, but also reactionaries of different shades speak of a "peoples' government", and obviously they don't mean the same thing.

From the standpoint of historical materialism, i.e. Marxism, the word "people" does not merely mean the sum total of individuals in a given country as bourgeois apologists teach, but has a specific historical and class content. It is a term which at each stage of the revolution encompasses the progressive and revolutionary classes and social forces. All those reactionary classes and forces that are against the revolution and social progress don't belong to the people but are anti-people. To be concrete, for example when we speak of the "people" in Ethiopia, we mean the working class, the peasantry, the progressive petty-bourgeois and other democratic forces, i.e. the vast majority of the people. The feudalists, comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie are not to be considered as part of the people, but rather a

anti-people forces.

Or let's take another example, - a historical one. During the great French Revolution 1789-93 as the bourgeoisie was still revolutionary and fought in the name of the people against feudalism, the terms "bourgeois" and "people" were interchangeable. The bourgeoisie was contemptuously called "the people" by the nobility and clergy. As a matter of fact, the word "bourgeois" is derived from the term "burgher" which was the name for the citizens of towns in the period of the birth of capitalism.

Hence if the term people refers to the revolutionary and progressive classes, it's clear that a "peoples' government" can only be a government of these forces. It means that the formerly ruling reactionary classes have been overthrown, and that the broad revolutionary masses have full power and exercise their democratic dictatorship over their enemies. Such a peoples government which is truly popular, can come only through the violent revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary ruling classes and the destruction of their state machinery. In a letter to Kugelmann on the occasion of the Paris Commune, Marx wrote,

"If you look up the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire, you will find that I declare that the next attempt of the French revolution will be no longer, as before, to transfer the bureaucratic-military machine from one hand to hand, but to smash it, and this is the precondition for every real people's revolution on the Continent" (Marx/Engels, Coll. Work, Vol. 33)

In very clear terms, Marx states that the precondition of every real people's revolution is the destruction of the state machinery and not the peaceful transfer of power from the ruling class to the oppressed masses - which is an absurdity. It also means that it's only through such a violent people's revolution that a people's government can come about.

This conception of a people's revolution and government was further elaborated and concretized by Lenin under the conditions of the 1905 Revolution and the struggle against the Mensheviks. With Lenin, the concept of a people's government is already filled with a definite class content and appears as the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Since the historical experiences of the Bolsheviks (Lenin) in the 1905 Revolution and against the Mensheviks contain so many valuable lessons which are fully valid and applicable to the present revolutionary struggle of the Ethiopian peoples, let us try to recapitulate the fundamental aspects of Lenin's views.

Long before the 1905 Revolution, in many of his articles, among other "The Hannibals of Liberalism", etc.. Lenin pointed out the incompatibility of Tsarist rule with the self-government of the people. Against the liberals he maintained that the prerequisite for the self-government of the people was the revolutionary overthrow of the autocratic Tsarist rule. The efforts to harmonize the two, i.e. Tsarism and people's rule, were described as illusionary, and in the final analysis, counter-revolutionary.

In the 1905 Revolution, Lenin developed this idea further. With the progress of the 1905 Revolution, the escalation of the people's struggle against Tsarism, the transition to armed insurrectionary uprisings and the defection of a part of the army to the people's cause, the question of the constitution of a popular organ of state power came to be on the order of day. The main differences between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks during this period concerned the character and content of this popular organ; and the conditions under which it can arise and exist. Or in other words, both wanted democracy, but the difference lay in the means of achieving democracy.

According to Lenin in revolutionary periods when the oppressed classes march to battle against their oppressors they should do so with the intent and will of being victorious. In this view the party of the proletariat must fill the working class and the laboring masses with the confidence of victory and show them the most advantageous, shortest

and straightest way towards victory.

"The need for reckoning with the zigzag path does not in the least do away with the fact that Marxists should be able to explain to the masses during the decisive moments of their history that the direct path is preferable, should be able to help the masses in the struggle for the choice of the direct path, to advance slogans for that struggle, and so on." Lenin, 'Against the boycott'.

The other way is the way of compromises with the forces of the old order, which is a circuitous path and goes through different stages, constitutional monarchy, etc..., and is most disadvantageous to the democratic revolution. According to Lenin, when one goes to battle, one does so with the intent to win, and not half-heartedly. - For he who fights half-heartedly and is out for compromises is bound to lose. Only he who's out to win, has the best prospects for being victorious and if defeated to emerge with the least losses. That meant, that in the people for the full victory of the revolution, and not for temporary and minimal goals.

It is from this viewpoint that the Bolsheviki started calling for the armed insurrection, complete overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy and the establishment of a revolutionary government, while the Mensheviks tantered with the idea of having a provisional government elected without overthrowing the Tsar.

It is on the basis of such a methodological approach to the problems of revolution and a deep understanding of the new character of the democratic revolution in the epoch of socialist revolutions that Lenin formulated the tactics of the Bolsheviks in 1905. As opposed to the Mensheviks, who were unable to grasp the changes in the character and content of the democratic revolution in the period of proletarian revolutions, it was the merit of Lenin to point out the particularities and significant transformations in the form and content of bourgeois-democratic revolutions in this new period. For Lenin, not only has the attitude of the bourgeoisie towards the democratic revolution changed, but also the class content of democratism and the alignment of classes within the revolutionary camp. For Lenin, the bourgeoisie was not longer a democratic force, but rather inclined

towards compromises with Tsarism, fearing the revolution more than reaction. It was therefore necessary to differentiate between the different elements of bourgeois democracy - between the liberal bourgeoisie that has gone over to the camp of counter-revolution and the mass of the democratic peasantry, capable of revolutionary actions against Tsarism. With the treachery of the bourgeoisie, it became incumbent upon the working class to assume the leadership of the movement, and together with the peasantry and democratic urban petty-bourgeoisie carry out the revolution to its end. This the Mensheviks never understood. Believing that the bourgeoisie was still a democratic force, they concluded from the bourgeois democratic character of the revolution, that it was the duty of Marxists to help the bourgeoisie come to power - and thus were led to pursue a counter-revolutionary line.

A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT OR AN ELECTIVE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT - TWO LINES AND TACTICS IN THE 1905 REVOLUTION

We had in the above stated that the main question that confronted Marxist revolutionaries at the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution, was how to bring about the overthrow of the Tsarist autocracy and with what kind of government it ought to be replaced. Let us examine the differing answers of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks to this question. According to Lenin, the prerequisite for the establishment of the government of the people or any sort of a popular organ of power whatsoever is the revolutionary overthrow of Tsarism. Lenin said that it was absurd to maintain that the Tsar will tolerate a democratic government of the people. According to Lenin,

"... a provisional revolutionary government alone, one, moreover, that will be the organ of a victorious popular insurrection, can secure full freedom of agitation in the election campaign and convene an assembly that will really express the will of the people. Is this postulate correct? Whoever took it into his head to dispute it would have to assert that it is possible for the tsarist government not to side with the reaction, that it is capable of being neutral during the elections, that it will see to it that the will of the people is really expressed. Such assertions are so absurd that no one would venture to defend them openly; but they are being surreptitiously smuggled in under liberal colors." (Two Tactics, p. 15)

Hence, in order to assure the fullest possible freedom, the people must first overthrow the Tsarist autocratic rule, and replace it by a provisional revolutionary government. The class content of such a provisional revolutionary government can only be the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

The fundamental aspects of Lenin's conception of a provisional revolutionary government can be enumerated as follows

a) The class content of such a popular organ is the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Formally, juristically seen, it'd be a provisional revolutionary government since it represents a transitional government relying on the armed might of a victorious insurrection. Lenin stresses that the form (i.e. provisional revolutionary government) and content (i.e. revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the broad masses) are inseparable.

b) Such a revolutionary government of the broad masses can ever come into being only after the successful overthrow of Tsarism and the destruction of the Tsarist state machinery - it is the result of an armed insurrection. -

"Only such a victory will be precisely a dictatorship, i.e. it must rely on military force, and the arming of the masses, and not on institutions of one kind or another established in a 'lawful' or 'peaceful' way." (Two Tactics)

The whole point of Lenin is that if one wants democracy and a people's government, one has to first carry out an armed revolution.

c) Only the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry can be the real guarantee of the people's freedom and assure the democratic convocation of a constituent assembly. A democratic election under the rule of Tsar is unthinkable.

d) It is the task of revolutionary Marxists to prepare the masses organizationally, politically and militarily for the armed struggle, to make them conscious of its inevitability, and to combat all reactionary manouvers that distract the masses from their actual historical tasks.

In general, we can sum up Lenin's considerations as follows. - in order to attain democracy, one must first create the material conditions for democracy; everything else is illusory.

The Mensheviks on the other hand were opposed to this position and propagated an opportunist line which among others, had the following points:

1) The Mensheviks never really set up the task of overthrowing the Tsarist autocracy as their main task. - Instead they concentrated on calling for the formation of a representative institution to be brought into existence as a result of the revolutionary pressure of the people and the like. Lenin points out that the Mensheviks here commit the same error as the liberals, who "prattle about a "constituent" assembly and bashfully shut their eyes to the fact that power and authority remain in the hands of the Tsar, forgetting that in order to "constitute" one must possess the power to do so." (Two Tactics, p.23)

Furthermore Lenin says that the Mensheviks,

"...forgot that so long as power remained in the hands of the Tsar, all decisions passed by any representatives whatsoever would remain empty and miserable prattle, as was the case with the "decisions" of the Frankfurt Parliament, famous in the history of the German Revolution of 1848." (ibd.)

2) The Mensheviks maintained that since the 1905 revolution was a bourgeois revolution, it was the task of Marxists to help the bourgeoisie come to power. The provisional government must be a government of the bourgeois. Their provisional popular government didn't express the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry but the rule of the bourgeoisie. This position was erroneous in two aspects:

a) The Mensheviks did not take into account that the bourgeoisie was no longer a democratic force, rather a hindrance to the democratic revolution.

b) This policy condemned the working class to tailing the bourgeoisie and be dependent on it.

3) The Mensheviks neglected the task of preparing the masses for the armed struggle and instead propagated parliamentary means of struggle during the 1905 Revolution. (See Conference Resolution of the Mensheviks) Their methods of struggles were of a parliamentary nature; elections, lobbying with the bourgeoisie, etc... at a time when the material conditions for the parliamentary form of struggle were nonexistent- and that was their mistake.

Before going over to deal with the historical experiences of other revolutions, we think it is expedient to have a look at the position of the renegade ESUNA/Federation leadership and compare it with that of the Mensheviks. As a matter of fact the renegade ESUNA/Federation leadership which has removed itself from the ranks of the Ethiopian Student Movement seems to have taken over the fundamental ideas of the Mensheviks in toto. Likewise, these renegades

maintain that it is possible or rather the task of the day
to institute through elections a provisional popular gov-
ernment--all we have to do is to ask the military government
to step down. The similarities of this position with those
of the Mensheviks are:

a) that just as much as the Mensheviks wanted a provisional government without overthrowing the Tsarist autocracy, the renegade ESUNA/Federation also believes that a popular government can come into being without an armed revolution--without the destruction of feudalism and imperialism in Ethiopia. Moreover, how on earth the military government will comply to their kind requests to step down is indeed a great mystery.

b) that the ESUNA/Federation leadership believe that electoral methods of struggle will work in Ethiopia, in a country that doesn't know the slightest inkling of democracy and where the material conditions for democracy don't exist.

Furthermore, the ESUNA/Federation leadership thinks that the provisional popular government it is struggling for, will be the government of the bourgeoisie. Let us quote them --

“ መሠረታዊ ስተራቲጂ ሳይ ቀየር በወሃሉ ሕዝቡ ስንገልጽ እንዲያውና እንደገናዘብው ለማረጋገጥ ሞገዚት መንግሥት ሊያስመርጠው የሚችለው የተረጋገጠ መንግሥት በአርገ ጥም የቦርዙዋ መንግሥት እንደሚሆንና የቦርዙዋም ዲሞክራሲ ዲሞክራሲ ለከብር ተው መሆኑን ማሳየት አለብን ማለት ገልጽና ቀኝ ደንደ ይመሰላል ... ”

/ 99. A. 6 Mat 99C 8 1974 AAA/78 14/

The renegade ESUNA/Federation leadership says that the government of the bourgeoisie "ᠮᠠᠨᠠᠭᠤᠯᠤᠰᠤ ᠨᠠᠭᠤᠯᠤᠰ" will guarantee bourgeois democratic liberties. In Combat-organ of ESUNA- we read that since the democratic petty-bourgeoisie is better than the fascistic petty-bourgeoisie we must struggle for a provisional popular government of the petty-bourgeoisie. - This is the same argument of the Mensheviks who used to say that we ought to support the bourgeoisie come to power and followed a policy of tailing the bourgeoisie.

A similar parallel to the differences within the Ethiopian left concerning the question of a people's government also existed during the June 1924 revolution in Albania. In the course of the June 1924 revolution, there arose the question whether one should call for a popular government of the bourgeoisie or struggle for a true people's government. We put down below what the Albanian communists have to say about it -

"...the bourgeois democrats lacked the resolution to carry the revolution through to the end, they feared the people more than the counter-revolution, and as a result, they compromised with reaction. This class was no longer to lead the new revolution, although the possibility of its participation in it was not excluded. It must be replaced by the communists, who were the most consistent revolutionaries, and the new revolution should bring to power not the bourgeois regime of 1924, although the latter was more progressive than Zog regime, but a popular regime.

H. Xelo, one of the outstanding representatives of the revolutionary younger generation, wrote in November 1928: 'It is not now in the interests of the Albanian people to establish the national bourgeoisie regime, because this was bankrupted on Dec. 24, 1924, but it is necessary and indispensable for the masses of labor to come to power.'

Here it was not a question of a proletarian revolution, nor of a socialist regime either, but of a people's revolution and a people's regime, the establishment of a dictatorship of workers and peasants which would fulfill and carry through the bourgeois democratic task, and would prepare the condition for raising the revolution to a higher level, to a socialist one."

Not to fight for any other government, than the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry! - that was the single correct policy of the

(Albanien) Communists in 1924. In Ethiopia too, where the petty-bourgeoisie who led the February movement has shown itself incapable of leading the revolution to its end, the task of revolutionaries is not to call for a so-called popular government of the petty-bourgeoisie, but to struggle for the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasant -, i.e. to carry on the democratic revolution to its end.

At this point, the well-known reactionaries in Algeria jump into the fray, and say well perhaps the provisional popular government is not a true people's government after all, but isn't it better than the "fascist junta"? They point out to Greece and say is not the Caramanlis government better than the former Papadopoulos/Gezakis fascist regime? To be brief -

a) firstly, the military government in Ethiopia, the way how things presently stand not a fascist government as the clique in Algeria maintains - it only shows how much ignorant they are about the essence of fascism .

b) secondly, during the rule fascist Papadopoulos/Gezakis regime in Greece, the revolutionary Greek communists didn't call for a "popular provisional government" of the Caramanlis type, but were struggling for LAOKRATIA - (Greek word for people's rule) As a matter of fact, it was the fascist junta in Greece that called upon Caramanlis to take over power, and the first thing that the revolutionary greek communists did was to announce that they would struggle against this farce vigorously. But this is all humbug for our friend Berhane Meskel and Company in Algeria - they want a Caramanlis type of government in Ethiopia under the overcoat of a "provisional popular government".

c) thirdly, it is absolutely illogical to argue for the necessity of a "provisional popular government" by saying it will be anyway better than the military government.

Well, for all that matters, is not a true people's government better than both? Why not struggle for it?

Let us go further and take another example from the experiences of the working class movement to show the reactionary nature of the slogan for an elective "provisional popular government".

Specifically, let us see the attitude of the degenerate and renegade communist party of Spain - the Carillo Group - to the recent events in that country. At a meeting held in W. Germany a month ago, the deputy general secretary of the CPS explained the policies of his party and called for the formation of a provisional government in Spain. Here are excerpts from press reports about the meeting. -

"...(the deputy general secretary) was unusually bitter in discussing the record of the Portuguese Communists, who he said had broken an agreement among the West European parties that they could try to come to power only through popular elections... he said (that the Portuguese Communist Party) had a "Petersburg complex" in trying to seize power by force in Lisbon, as the Bolsheviks had in Russia in 1917."

After accusing the communist party of Portugal of trying to seize power by force, the deputy general secretary of the renegade CPS, further said according to the same press reports that

"Prince Juan Carlos should appoint a provisional government representing the democratic groups and then call for elections to choose a popular government." (International Herald Tribune Nov. 6/75)

This is how a traitor to the Spanish working class speaks! and fits almost literally word for word to the statements of those forces in Ethiopia calling for a provisional popular government! Indeed birds of a feather, flock together!

One thing the statement of the deputy general secretary of CPS shows is that an armed revolution and the electoral methods of coming to power are mutually exclusive. On the other hand the real revolutionary forces in Spain are not struggling for an elective so-called popular government but for the revolutionary overthrow of Franco's fascism and the establishment of a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the broad masses under the leadership of the working class.

To sum up, the experiences of the different democratic revolutions in the world teach us that to talk of a popular government without overthrowing the ruling classes via armed revolution and without creating the material conditions for democracy, is pure nonsense - is the talk only of opportunists and renegades.

THE QUESTION OF PROVISIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT IN ETHIOPIA

With the disposal of Haile Selassie and the accession of the Derg to power, a large section of the "Ethiopian Left" had called for the establishment of a provisional popular government to be constituted out of the Derg and representatives of the different sections of the population. At the beginning this demand reflected the aspirations and hopes of the sections of the petty-bourgeoisie that were shoved aside by the military takeover, and who felt they were justified in demanding their share of power.

Our union, the Ethiopian Students Union in Europe, had from the beginning consistently fought against this slogan, because of the following reasons:

a) So long imperialism and feudalism are not destroyed but continue to determine the destiny of the Ethiopian peoples, there could exist no popular government in Ethiopia. Only when the broad masses enjoy the fullest democratic liberties - that is, feudal and imperialist oppression are

done away with - does the possibility for the establishment of popular government exist.

b) The so-called "provisional popular government" to be constituted out of the different sections of the population can not be truly a government of the popular masses. Only the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry can be a popular government, a government of the popular masses. So long the state apparatus and the decisive instruments of power are in the hands of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and enemies of the revolution, no election, can whatsoever lead to the establishment of a popular government. Under the socio-political reality in Ethiopia, the only forces that could benefit from such elections are the feudalists, imperialists and bureaucratic bourgeoisie - what would emerge is only their government under the cloak "provisional popular government". No wonder these forces are vociferously calling for a "provisional popular government".

c) A Popular government is not the result of an election after the Derg complies with the demand "to step down", but is the result of the revolutionary armed struggle of the people. Moreover, to call upon the masses to go to the polls, at a time when they are engaged in a revolutionary struggle against their enemies, is to distract them from their revolutionary tasks. In revolutionary periods the parliamentary forms of struggle are replaced by direct and revolutionary forms of struggle. The main task of the day is not to call upon the masses to elect a "popular" government but to prepare the people organizationally, politically and militarily for the new democratic revolution - which alone can bring about a truly popular government; a people's government.

A most stupid argument given by those who call themselves "progressive" for the so-called provisional popular government is allegedly the fact that it could give the people democratic rights. - But if democratic rights could be attained through an elective "provisional popular government", that means there is no longer any need for the democratic revolution - and that is the flaw of the argument above. In reality

however, democratic liberties are the results of the democratic revolution, - which presupposes the destruction of the anti-democratic forces, i.e. Imperialism and Feudalism, in Ethiopia. - Those who call for a "provisional popular government" however assume that one could get democracy without the democratic revolution - all that has got to be done is call upon the Derg to step down. This is not only illusionary but also reactionary - deludes the masses as to the perspectives of struggles. It is like wanting the results of the democratic revolution, without having to carry out the democratic revolution.

The dialectic of the February movement showed that political liberties are only the products of the revolutionary struggle of the broad masses against Imperialism and Feudalism. The political liberties the people enjoyed during the Eudalkachew/June period, where not the gifts of a "provisionally elected popular government" or any other sort of reformat government whatsoever, but rather the direct results of the people's struggle. It showed that democracy can only be won along the path of struggle. This lesson that been paid for by the blood fo the Ethiopian peoples, seems to have been forgotten by those petty-bourgeoisie opportunists, that now trail behind the footsteps of the "Ethiopian Democratic Union."

No wonder therefore, that the great majority of those sincere revolutionaries and democrats, as a result of their own experiences and the ideological struggle carried out by revolutionaries against this slogan, came to realize the reactionary content of this slogan and have repudiated it. To that extent too, we have the feudalists, bureaucratic-bourgeoisie and imperialists embrace this slogan and call for a popular government.

Aside from the Federation, the youth organization of Assfa Woassen, the forces that are presently calling for a popular government are the feudalists, bureaucrat capitalists, the Ethiopian Democratic Union and the underground paper "DEMOCRACIA".

Let us see what the dean of the feudalists, Asfa Wossew, has to say about the question of the popular government. - After stating that he's for a democratically elected government, he said:

"Since their (of the Derg - author) avaricious greed for power knows no limits, only a few weeks ago they announced that, since the Ethiopian people are not politically emancipated enough to shape their own destiny, they will not hand over political power to a popularly elected Government and parliament."
(March 30/75, London)

One could have sworn this were a quotation from Combat or for all that matters from Democracia - but unfortunately from Asfa Wossew. Furthermore we have the rightist counter-revolutionary Ethiopian Democratic Union which calls in the manner of the Federation renegades for the establishment "of a democratically constituted civilian government".
(See Communiqué, Oct. 8/75) Moreover, the rightist Coup d'état of April 75 hatched out by the imperialists and bureaucratic bourgeoisie and headed by Colonel Negassie Desta and Company sought not only the return of Haile Selassie as a constitutional monarch, but also the institution of a "popular civilian government".

The call for an "elective provisional popular government" is so acceptable to these counter-revolutionaries - so sweet music in their ears! Why? Because it corresponds to their class interests under the present conditions in Ethiopia. It is with such deadly enemies of the Ethiopian revolution that the would be "marxist" EPRP which unashamedly calls for a "provisional popular government" marches together with. Lenin in writing about the Mensheviks said:

"The difference between us in this respect is that we march side by side with the revolutionary and republican bourgeoisie, without merging with it, whereas you march side by side with the liberal

and monarchist bourgeoisie, also without merging with it. That is how matters stand.

The tactical slogans you have formulated in the name of the Conference coincide with the slogans of the "Constitutional-Democratic" Party, i.e., the party of the monarchist bourgeoisie, moreover, you did not even notice or realize this coincidence, thus actually following at the tail of the Osvobozhdentsi." (Two Tactics)

However if we do not sink in the mire of phrasology and are not intoxicated with the mere word "popular" but give it a definite class content and understand by it the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat - that is something which the feudalists and all counter-revolutionaries do not naturally accept but bitterly oppose. And that is not bad, but good. Moreover this correct slogan does not only enlighten the broad masses about the class content of a truly popular government, but also shows them the path along which it can be attained - the path of revolution.

Presently in Ethiopia, there are two contradictory slogans, which are posed as the main task of the day. The first slogan calls for the arming and organization of the people; the second slogan calls for the establishment of a "provisional popular government". It does not require much thinking to realize that both slogans are mutually exclusive.

The first slogan which calls for the arming of the people is the correct and revolutionary one. It points out the main link in the chain of tasks and expresses the most fundamental condition under the present reality in Ethiopia necessary to advance the revolutionary struggle forward. The second slogan is an opportunist, yes, reactionary slogan. Not only does it sow confusion regarding the real material conditions necessary to carry the revolution forward, but also works in the hands of the feudalists and bureaucratic capitalists, who in calling for a "popular provisional government" are staging the scene for their comeback.

QUOTATIONS FROM LENIN: on the conditions and
class content of a prov. revolutionary gov't.

We have in the following a selection of quotations from the works of Lenin written around the 1905 Revolution. We hope that these quotations will provide the reader with a better understanding of the Leninist position on this question-- and illustrate the Cadetist and Osvobozhdeniye-ist character of the elective so-called "provisional popular government."

Our reader can personally check the authenticity of the quotations and also that they represent the real views of Lenin on this question. To this we have provided the selection with a table of the cited works.

Such is the plan of the practical politicians of liberalism. Not a foolish plan at all. It deliberately provides for the preservation of the monarchy and the admission of a Constituent Assembly of the whole people only alongside of the monarchy. The bourgeoisie does not want to have the existing government overthrown or the monarchy replaced by a republic. Therefore, the Russian bourgeoisie (on the pattern of the German bourgeoisie of 1848) stands for a "deal" between the people and the throne. Such a policy can be successful only if neither of these parties engaged in the struggle, neither the people nor the throne, is able to win the day, only if their strength is balanced. Then and only then will the bourgeoisie be able to join with the monarchy and keep a tight hold on the people, compel them to put up with one--"third"--or perhaps one-hundredth part, of the power. The Constituent Assembly of the whole people will be just strong enough to make the tsar grant a constitution, but it will not and must not (from the point of view of the bourgeoisie's interests) be any stronger. It must only counterbalance the monarchy, but not overthrow it; it must leave the material instruments of power (the army, etc.) in the hands of the monarchy.

The *Osvobozhdeniye* Leaguers laugh at the Shipovists for wanting to give the tsar the power of authority and the people the power of opinion. But is not their position essentially identical with that of the Shipovists? They do not want to give the people *all* the power either; they, too, stand for a *compromise* between the power of the tsar and the opinion of the people!

We thus see that the interests of the bourgeoisie as a class quite naturally and inevitably lead it at the present revolutionary moment to advance the slogan of a Constituent Assembly of the people, but in no case the slogan of a *provisional revolutionary government*. The first slogan is or has become the slogan of the policy of compromise, huckstering, and brokerage; the second is the slogan of revolutionary struggle. The first is the slogan of the monarchist bourgeoisie, the second, the slogan of the revolutionary people. The first slogan makes it possible chiefly to preserve the monarchy, despite the revolutionary onset of the people; the second offers the straight road to the republic. The first leaves the power with the tsar, restricted only by public opinion; the second is the only slogan which consistently and unreservedly leads to the sovereignty of the people in the full sense of the word. 1

If the Russian autocracy, even at this stage, fails to find a way out by buying itself off with a meagre constitution, if it is not only shaken but actually *overthrown*, then, obviously, a tremendous exertion of revolutionary energy on the part of all progressive classes will be called for to defend this gain. This "defence", however, is nothing else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry! 2

To take, for instance, *Iskra's* latest attempt to set up a distinction between the provisional revolutionary government and the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Is this not an example of lifeless scholasticism? People who invent such distinctions are capable of stringing together fine words but are absolutely incapable of thinking. Actually, these concepts stand to each other roughly in the relation of legal form to class content. To speak of the "provisional revolutionary government" is to stress the constitutional aspect of the case, the fact that the government originates, not from the law, but from the revolution, that it is a temporary government committed to the future Constituent Assembly. But whatever the form, whatever the origin, whatever the conditions, one thing at any rate is clear: that the provisional revolutionary government must have the support of definite classes. One has only to remember this simple truth to realise that the provisional revolutionary government can be nothing else but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Therefore, *Iskra's* distinction only drags the Party back to fruitless disputes, away from the task of making a concrete analysis of the class interests in the Russian revolution. 3

Only the armed people, organised in a *revolutionary army*, which has won over to its side all decent and honest elements in the tsar's army, has overcome the tsar's forces and substituted a *provisional revolutionary government* for the tsar's autocratic government.

Indeed, let us take that now current and generally accepted slogan, "For a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal, direct, and equal suffrage by secret ballot". Is that slogan adequate from the standpoint of consistent democracy? Is it adequate in the light of the urgent revolutionary tasks of the present moment? The answer to both these questions can be only in the negative. To be convinced that this is so one has only to examine carefully our Party programme, to which our organisations, unfortunately, do not often refer and which they quote and disseminate all too little. (As a happy exception, worthy of the widest emulation, we note the recent reprint of our Party programme in leaflet form by the Riga, Voronezh, and Moscow committees.) The keynote of our programme, too, is the demand for a popular Constituent Assembly (let us agree, for brevity's sake, to use the word "popular" as denoting suffrage that is universal, etc.). But this slogan does not stand isolated in our programme. The context and the addenda and notes prevent any misconstruction on the part of those who are least consistent in the struggle for liberty or who even struggle against it. It occurs in our programme in conjunction with the following other slogans: (1) the *overthrow of the tsarist autocracy*; (2) its replacement by the *democratic republic*; (3) the *sovereignty of the people*, safeguarded by a democratic constitution, i.e., the concentration of *supremo governmental authority entirely* in the hands of a legislative assembly composed of representatives of the people and forming a single chamber.

In plain and simple Russian, an organ of power of the people which temporarily assumes the duties of a government that has collapsed is called a provisional revolutionary government. Such a government is bound to be provisional, for its authority expires with the convocation of a constituent assembly representing the whole people. Such a government is bound to be revolutionary, for it replaces a government that has collapsed, and it does so with the support of the revolution. The very replacement of one by the other cannot occur other than by revolutionary means. Such a government must become an "organ of power of the people", carrying out everywhere the demands put forward by the people and replacing at once, immediately and everywhere all the old, autocratic and Black-Hundred "organs of power" by organs of power of the people, i.e., either by representatives of the provisional revolutionary government or by elected persons in all cases where elections are possible—on the basis, of course, of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. 4

To establish a new order "that will really express the will of the people" it is not enough to term a representative assembly a constituent assembly. Such an assembly must have the authority and power to "constitute". Conscious of this the Congress resolution does not confine itself to the formal slogan of a "constituent assembly", but adds the material conditions which alone will enable such an assembly to carry out its task properly. This specification of the conditions enabling an assembly that is constituent in name to become one in fact is imperatively necessary. for, as we have more than once pointed out, the liberal bourgeoisie, as represented by the Constitutional-Monarchist Party, is deliberately distorting the slogan of a popular constituent assembly, and reducing it to a hollow phrase.

The Congress resolution states that a provisional revolutionary government alone, and one, moreover, that will be the organ of a victorious popular insurrection, can secure full freedom to conduct an election campaign and convene an assembly that will really express the will of the people. Is this thesis correct? Whoever took it into his head to dispute it would have to assert that it is possible for the tsarist government not to side with reaction, that it is capable of being neutral during the elections, that it will see to it that the will of the people really finds expression. Such assertions are so absurd that no one would venture to defend them openly; but they are being surreptitiously smuggled in under liberal colours, by our *Osvobozhdeniye* gentry. Somebody must convene the constituent assembly; somebody must guarantee the freedom and fairness of the elections; somebody must invest such an assembly with full power and authority. Only a revolutionary government, which is the organ of the insurrection, can desire this in all sincerity, and be capable of doing all that is required to achieve this. The tsarist government will inevitably oppose it. A liberal government which has come to terms with the tsar and which does not rely in full on the popular uprising, cannot sincerely desire this, and could not accomplish it, even if it most sincerely desired to. Therefore, the Congress resolution gives the only correct and entirely consistent democratic slogan. 5

Thus, we are told that a decisive victory of the revolution over tsarism may be marked either by a victorious insurrection, or ... by a representative institution's decision to set up a constituent assembly! What does that mean? How are we to understand it? A decisive victory may be marked by a "decision" to set up a constituent assembly?? And such a "victory" is put side by side with the establishment of a provisional government which will "emerge from a victorious popular insurrection"!! The Conference failed to note that a *victorious* popular insurrection and the *establishment* of a provisional government would signify the victory of the revolution *in actual fact*, whereas a "decision" to set up a constituent assembly would signify a victory of the revolution *in words* only.

The Conference of the new-*Iskra* Mensheviks fell into the very error that the liberals, the *Osvobozhdeniye* group, are constantly making. The *Osvobozhdeniye* group prattle about a "constituent" assembly, bashfully shutting their eyes to the fact that power and authority remain in the hands of the tsar and forgetting that to "constitute" one must possess the power to do so. The Conference also forgot that it is a far cry from a "decision" adopted by representatives—no matter who they are—to the fulfilment of that decision. The Conference also forgot that while power remains in the hands of the tsar all decisions of any representatives whatsoever will remain empty and miserable prattle, as was the case with the "decisions" of the Frankfort Parliament, famous in the history of the German Revolution of 1848. In his *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*¹¹ Marx, the representative of the revolutionary proletariat, castigated the Frankfort *Osvobozhdeniye*-type liberals with merciless sarcasm, precisely because they uttered fine words, adopted all sorts of democratic "decisions", "constituted" all kinds of liberties, while in fact they left power in the hands of the king and failed to organise an armed struggle against the military forces at the king's disposal. 6

It is possible that the tsarist government will succeed in convening a representative assembly for the purpose of striking a deal with the liberal bourgeoisie; providing for that eventuality, the Third Congress resolution speaks plainly about "hypocritical policy", "pseudo-democracy", "a travesty of popular representation, such as the so-called Zemsky Sobor".*But the whole point is that this is not said in a resolution on a provisional revolutionary government, for it had nothing to do with a provisional revolutionary government. This eventuality defers the problem of the insurrection and of

the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government; it alters this problem, etc. The point at issue today is not that all kinds of combinations are possible, that both victory and defeat are possible or that there may be direct or circuitous paths; the point is that it is impermissible for a Social-Democrat to cause confusion in workers' minds as to which is the genuinely revolutionary path; that it is impermissible to describe as a decisive victory, as *Osvobozhdeniye* does, something which lacks the *main condition* for victory. It is possible that we shall win even the eight-hour day, not at one stroke, but only in a long and round-about way; but what would you say of a man who calls such impotence, such weakness as renders the proletariat *incapable* of counteracting procrastination, delays, haggling, treachery, and reaction—a victory for the workers? It is possible that the Russian revolution will end in an "abortive constitution", as was once stated in *Vperyod*,* but can this justify a Social-Democrat, who on the eve of a decisive struggle would call this abortion a "decisive victory over tsarism"? It is possible that at worst we shall not only fail to win a republic but that even the constitution will be illusory, a constitution "*à la* Shipov",¹⁴ but would it be pardonable for a Social-Democrat to tone down our republican slogan? 7

— — —

To advance the revolution, to take it beyond the limits to which the monarchist bourgeoisie advances it, it is necessary actively to produce, emphasise, and bring into the forefront slogans that will preclude the "inconsistency" of bourgeois democracy. At present there are *only two* such slogans: 1) a provisional revolutionary government, and 2) a republic, because the slogan of a popular constituent assembly has been accepted by the monarchist bourgeoisie (see the programme of the *Osvobozhdeniye* League) and accepted for the very purpose of devitalising the revolution, preventing its complete victory, and enabling the big bourgeoisie to strike a huckster's bargain with tsarism. And now we see that of the two slogans, which alone are capable of advancing the revolution, the Conference completely forgot the slogan of a republic, and plainly put the slogan of a provisional revolutionary government on a par with the *Osvobozhdeniye* slogan of a popular constituent assembly, calling both the one and the other "a decisive victory of the revolution"! 8

— — —

What is meant by "the revolution's decisive victory over tsarism"? We have already seen that in using this expression the new-*Iskra* group fail to grasp even its immediate political significance. Still less do they seem to understand the class essence of this concept. Surely, we Marxists must not under any circumstances allow ourselves to be deluded by words, such as "revolution" or "the great Russian revolution", as do many revolutionary democrats (of the Gapon type). We must be perfectly certain in our minds as to what real social forces are opposed to "tsarism" (which is a real force perfectly intelligible to all) and are capable of gaining a "decisive victory" over it. The big bourgeoisie, the landlords, the factory owners, and "society", which follows the *Osvobozhdeniye* lead, cannot be such a force. We see that they do not even want a decisive victory. We know that owing to their class position they are incapable of waging a decisive struggle against tsarism; they are too heavily fettered by private property, by capital and land to enter into a decisive struggle. They stand in too great need of tsarism, with its bureaucratic, police, and military forces for use against the proletariat and the peasantry, to want it to be destroyed. No, the only force capable of gaining "a decisive victory over tsarism", is the people, i.e., the proletariat and the peasantry, if we take the main, big forces, and distribute the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie (also part of "the people") between the two. "The revolution's decisive victory over tsarism" means the establishment of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Our new-*Iskra* group cannot escape from this conclusion, which *Vperyod* indicated long ago. No other force is capable of gaining a decisive victory over tsarism. And such a victory will be precisely a dictatorship, i.e., it must inevitably rely on military force, on the arming of the masses, on an insurrection, and not on institutions of one kind or another established in a "lawful" or "peaceful" way. It can be only a dictatorship, for realisation of the changes urgently and absolutely indispensable to the proletariat and the peasantry will evoke desperate resistance from the landlords, the big bourgeoisie, and tsarism. Without a dictatorship it is impossible to break down that resistance and repel counter-revolutionary attempts. But of course it will be a democratic, not a socialist dictatorship. It will be unable (without a series of intermediary stages of revolutionary development) to affect the foundations of capitalism. At best, it may bring about a radical redistribution of landed property in favour of the peasantry, establish consistent and full democracy, including the formation of a republic, eradicate all the oppressive features of Asiatic bondage, not only in rural but also in factory life, 9

— — —

Thus, we arrive at the indubitable conclusion that it is the new-*Iskra* tactics which, by its objective significance, is playing into the hands of the bourgeois democrats. The preaching of organisational diffuseness which goes to the length of plebiscites, the principle of compromise, and the divorce of Party literature from the Party; belittling of the aims of insurrection; confusing of the popular political slogans of the revolutionary proletariat with those of the monarchist bourgeoisie; distortion of the requisites for "revolution's decisive victory over tsarism"—all these taken together produce that very policy of tailism in a revolutionary period, which bewilders the proletariat, disorganises it, confuses its understanding, and belittles the tactics of Social-Democracy instead of pointing out the only way to victory and getting all the revolutionary and republican elements of the people to adhere to the proletariat's slogan. ¹⁰

Only an armed uprising can be that slogan. The government's convocation of a crudely faked "popular" representative body provides excellent opportunities for agitation for a truly popular representative body, for making the broadest masses of the people understand that at present (after the tsar's frauds and his mockery of the people) only a provisional revolutionary government can convene a truly representative body, and that to establish such a government the victory of an insurrection and the actual overthrow of tsarist rule are necessary. It would be hard to imagine a better time for widespread agitation for an uprising and in order to conduct that agitation full clarity regarding the programme of a provisional revolutionary government is also necessary. This programme should consist of the six points which we have indicated previously (see *Proletary*, No. 7, "The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Government*"): 1) convocation of a popular constituent assembly; 2) arming of the people; 3) political freedom—the immediate repeal of all laws that contradict it; 4) complete cultural and political freedom for all oppressed and disfranchised nationalities—the Russian people cannot win liberty for themselves without fighting for the liberty of the other nationalities; 5) an eight-hour working day; 6) the establishment of peasant committees for the support and implementation of all democratic reforms, among them agrarian reforms, up to and including the confiscation of the landlords' land. ¹¹

To anyone who, because of this conclusion, would accuse us of a penchant for paradoxes, we issue the following challenge: let him refute the proposition that, if we are not strong enough to bring the revolution to a successful conclusion, if the revolution ends in a "decisive victory" in the *Osvobozhdeniye* sense, i.e., only in the form of a representative assembly convened by the tsar, one that could be called a constituent assembly only in derision—then that will be a revolution in which the landlord and big bourgeois element will preponderate. On the other hand, if we are destined to live through a really great revolution, if history does not allow a "miscarriage" this time, if we are strong enough to carry the revolution to a successful conclusion, to a decisive victory, not in the *Osvobozhdeniye* or the new-*Iskra* sense of the word, then that will be a revolution in which the peasant and proletarian element will preponderate. ¹²

There is nothing more ridiculous than this pompous advancement of the slogan of "extreme opposition" in a resolution which begins by referring to a "decisive victory of the revolution" and to a "popular insurrection"! Try to conceive, gentlemen, what it means to be the "extreme opposition" in a period of insurrection. Does it mean exposing the government, or deposing it? Does it mean voting against the government, or defeating its armed forces in open battle? Does it mean refusing to replenish the government's exchequer, or the revolutionary seizure of that exchequer for the needs of the uprising, to arm the workers and peasants, and to convoke a constituent assembly? Are you not beginning to understand, gentlemen, that the term "extreme opposition" expresses only negative actions—exposing, voting against, refusing? Why is that so? Because this term applies only to the parliamentary struggle and, moreover, in a period when no one makes "decisive victory" the immediate object of the struggle. Are you not beginning to understand that things change cardinally in this respect, from the moment the politically oppressed people launch a determined attack along the whole front in desperate struggle for victory?

The workers ask us: Must the urgent business of insurrection be energetically begun? What is to be done to make the incipient insurrection victorious? What use should be made of victory? What programme can and should then be implemented? The new-*Iskrists*, who are making Marxism more profound, answer: we must remain the party of extreme revolutionary opposition. . . . Well, were we not right in calling these knights past masters of philistinism? ¹³

Revolutions are the locomotives of history, said Marx. "Revolutions are festivals of the oppressed and the exploited. At no other time are the mass of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order, as at a time of revolution. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles, if judged by the limited, philistine yardstick of gradualist progress. But it is essential that leaders of the revolutionary parties, too, should advance their aims more comprehensively and boldly at such a time, so that their slogans shall always be in advance of the revolutionary initiative of the masses, serve as a beacon, reveal to them our democratic and socialist ideal in all its magnitude and splendour, and show them the shortest and most direct route to complete, absolute, and decisive victory. Let us leave to the opportunists of the *Osvobozhdeniye* bourgeoisie the task of inventing roundabout, circuitous paths of compromise, out of fear of the revolution and of the direct path. If we are forcibly compelled to drag ourselves along such paths we shall be able to fulfil our duty in petty, everyday work also. But first let the choice of path be decided in ruthless struggle. We shall be traitors, betrayers of the revolution, if we do not use this festive energy of the masses and their revolutionary ardour to wage a ruthless and self-sacrificing struggle for the direct and decisive path. Let the bourgeois opportunists contemplate the future reaction with craven fear. The workers will not be intimidated either by the thought that reaction intends to be terrible, or that the bourgeoisie proposes to recoil. The workers do not expect to make deals; they are not asking for petty concessions. What they are striving towards is ruthlessly to crush the reactionary forces, i.e., to set up a *revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry*. 14

Thirdly, history also confirms the truth (incidentally, a self-evident truth) that only the complete and decisive victory of an uprising can make it fully possible to establish genuine self-government. Would the municipal revolution in France in July 1789 have been possible if on July 14 the people of Paris, who had risen in arms, had not defeated the royal troops, taken the Bastille, and completely smashed the resistance of the autocracy? Or will the new-Iskrist, perhaps, cite in this connection the example of the city of Montpellier, where the municipal revolution, the establishment of revolutionary local self-government took place peacefully, and a vote of thanks to the intendant was even passed for the kindness with which he had assisted in his own deposition? Does the new *Iskra* perhaps expect that during our Duma election campaign we shall thank the governors for having eliminated themselves before the capture of the Russian Bastilles? 15

Thirdly, and lastly, it follows from these words that Marx castigated the bourgeois democrats for entertaining "constitutional illusions" in a period of revolution and open civil war. The meaning of these words becomes particularly obvious from the article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of June 6, 1848. "A constituent national assembly," Marx wrote, "must first of all be an active, revolutionary-active assembly. The Frankfort Assembly, however, is busying itself with school exercises in parliamentarianism while allowing the government to act. Let us assume that this learned assembly succeeds, after mature consideration, in evolving the best possible agenda and the best constitution, but what is the use of the best possible agenda and of the best possible constitution, if the German governments have in the meantime placed the bayonet on the agenda?" 51

That is the meaning of the slogan: dictatorship. We can judge from this what Marx's attitude would have been towards resolutions which call a "decision to organise a constituent assembly" a decisive victory, or which invite us to "remain the party of extreme revolutionary opposition"!

Major questions in the life of nations are settled only by force. The reactionary classes themselves are usually the first to resort to violence, to civil war; they are the first to "place the bayonet on the agenda", as the Russian autocracy has systematically and unswervingly been doing everywhere ever since January 9. And since such a situation has arisen, since the bayonet has really become the main point on the political agenda, since insurrection has proved imperative and urgent—constitutional illusions and school exercises in parliamentarianism become merely a screen for the bourgeois betrayal of the revolution, a screen to conceal the fact that the bourgeoisie is "recoiling" from the revolution. It is precisely the slogan of dictatorship that the genuinely revolutionary class must advance, in that case. 16

So long as the forces for an armed uprising and its victory are still lacking, it is ridiculous even to speak of revolutionary people's self-government. That is not the prologue to an uprising, but its epilogue. Such erroneous tactics would merely play into the hands of the *Osvobozhdeniye* bourgeoisie, in the first place by obscuring or shelving the slogan of an uprising, and replacing it with the slogan of the organisation of revolutionary self-government. In the second place, it would make it easier for the liberal bourgeois to represent *their* (Zemstvo and municipal) elections as popular elections, since there can be no popular elections so long as the tsar retains power, and the liberals may yet succeed in carrying out Zemstvo and municipal elections despite Mr. Durnovo's threats. 17

This peaceful idyll looks very much like putting revolution off until the Greek calends.⁷⁷ Who is to organise the nation in a popular representation? The autocracy? But the latter consents to organise only the Bulygin Duma, which you yourselves are protesting against and refuse to recognise as popular representation! Or, perhaps, the "nation" will itself organise representation of the people? If so, why is it that the liberals are dead set against a provisional revolutionary government, which can rely only on a revolutionary army? Why is it that, while at their congress they spoke in the name of the people, the liberals are taking no step that would signify the nation being organised in a popular representation? If, gentlemen, you really represent the people and not the bourgeoisie which betrays the interests of the people in the revolution, why don't you appeal to the army? Why don't you announce a break with the autocratic monarchy? Why do you shut your eyes to the inevitability of a decisive struggle between the army of revolution and the army of tsarism?

The reason is that you are afraid of the revolutionary people; 18

These words clearly show that our Party is concerned not only with the purely formal, but also with the material conditions for the convocation of a constituent assembly, i.e., with the conditions which would make such an assembly truly national and truly constituent. It is not enough to call an assembly "constituent", it is not enough to convene representatives of the people, even though they be chosen by universal and equal suffrage, direct elections and secret ballot, even though freedom of elections be really guaranteed. In addition to all these conditions, it is necessary that the constituent assembly have the authority and the force to constitute a new order. There have been cases in the history of revolutions when an assembly was nominally constituent, while in actual fact real force and power were not in its hands but in the hands of the old autocracy. This was the case in the German revolution of 1848, which explains why the "constituent" assembly of that period, the notorious Frankfurt Parliament, acquired the shameful reputation of a contemptible "talking shop". That assembly babbled about freedom, decreed freedom, but took no practical steps to remove the government institutions which were destroying freedom. It is quite natural, therefore, that that pitiable assembly of pitiable liberal-bourgeois prattlers withdrew from the scene in ignominy.

The new-Iskra resolution on the attitude to opposition parties states in black and white that the Social-Democrats "demand of all enemies of tsarism":

"1) Active and unequivocal support of all determined action by the organised proletariat directed towards dealing fresh blows at tsarism."

In proposing an "agreement" with the *Osvobozhdeniye* League and promising them "support", Parvus demands nothing of the kind.

"2) Open recognition and unqualified support of the demand for a popular constituent assembly elected on the basis of universal, etc., suffrage, and open action against all parties and groups that are trying to curtail the rights of the people, whether it be by limiting suffrage or by accepting the grant of a monarchist constitution in lieu of a constituent assembly."

Parvus repudiates the whole of the second part of these conditions. He even completely disregards the question of whom the *Osvobozhdeniye* League members in the Duma should "demand the convocation" of a constituent assembly from. From the tsar, no doubt? But why shouldn't you convoke it yourselves, esteemed heroes of "parliamentary agreement"? Or are you no longer opposed to having it "granted" by the tsar? 19

But what does it mean? How is this overthrow of the present government to take place? Who is to convene the Constituent Assembly, which even the *Osvobozhdeniye* people (see issue No. 67 of *Osvobozhdeniye*) are now prepared to advance as their slogan, including the demand for universal, direct, and equal suffrage? Precisely what should constitute the real guarantee that the elections to such an assembly will be free and will express the interests of the whole people?

He who fails to give a clear and definite answer to these questions does not grasp the meaning of the slogan "Down with the Autocracy". And these questions inevitably bring us to the question of the provisional revolutionary government; it is not difficult to understand that really free, popular elections to a Constituent Assembly, fully guaranteeing truly universal, equal, and direct suffrage by secret ballot, are not only improbable, but actually impossible under the autocracy. And if we are in earnest in putting forward a practical demand for the immediate overthrow of the autocratic government, we must be clear in our minds as to precisely what other government we want to replace the one that is to be overthrown. In other words, what do we think should be the attitude of the Social-Democrats towards a provisional revolutionary government?

No, my dear Parvus! So long as there is no parliament in Russia, applying the tactics of parliamentarianism to Russia means so much unbecoming playing at parliamentarianism, means turning into hangers-on to the landlords, instead of being leaders of the revolutionary workers and politically conscious peasants. To enter into secret deals with the Rodichevs and the Petrunkeviches about support for them against Stakhovich, as a substitute for temporary agreements between open political parties, which are non-existent in our country, means sowing corruption in the workers' midst. ²⁰

It is quite natural for the liberal monarchist bourgeoisie to gloss over the question of the method of convening a constituent assembly. For representatives of the revolutionary proletariat it is totally impermissible. ²¹

As we have pointed out hundreds of times, the *Osvobozhdeniye* League, i.e., the monarchist bourgeoisie, wants just such a "liquidation" as would bring about the transfer of power to the bourgeoisie without a popular uprising, or, at any rate, without the complete victory of an uprising of the people. Manilovist plans for "elections" while the autocracy remains in power play entirely into the hands of the liberal bourgeoisie, which alone is capable of producing anything at all resembling such elections. ²²

Full freedom of election, and full power for a constituent assembly can be ensured only by the complete victory of the uprising, the overthrow of tsarist rule, and its replacement by a provisional revolutionary government. To this end all our efforts must be directed; the organisation and preparation of an uprising must absolutely stand in the foreground. Only in the measure in which the rising is victorious and in which victory leads to the decisive destruction of the enemy—only in that measure will an assembly of the people's representatives be a popular one not only on paper, and constituent not only in name. ²³

1. The preamble speaks of the only way out of the present situation. In this connection the entire stress is placed on the *idea* of a constituent assembly, and not a word is said as to *who* is to call it, so that the "way out" should be not merely on paper, but *in actual fact*. Silence on this score amounts to Social-Democrats yielding to the *Osvobozhdeniye* gentry. As we have repeatedly pointed out, it is the interests of the monarchist-liberal bourgeoisie that oblige the *Osvobozhdeniye* gentry to limit themselves to the convocation of a popular constituent assembly, and pass over in silence the question of who is to call it. This, as we have repeatedly pointed out, is the very question that the developing revolution has brought into the forefront, and herein at present lies the fundamental difference between the bourgeoisie's opportunist ("compromise") tactics and the proletariat's revolutionary tactics. By their resolution the new-*Iskra* supporters have furnished documentary proof of their incurable blindness in fundamental questions of tactics, and of their relapsing into *Osvobozhdeniye* slogans.

In the succeeding sections the resolution still more confuses the question of the convocation of a popular constituent assembly. Propaganda which proclaims confidence in the State Duma on this score is downright reactionary, while to say that a constituent assembly should be convened by a "democratic organisation of the people" is much like proposing to call a constituent assembly through a committee of friends of the people living on the planet Mars. At their all-Russia Conference the new-*Iskrists* committed an unpardonable error in placing the convocation of a popular constituent assembly by a revolutionary government *on a par* with its convocation by a representative institution. The new-*Iskrists* have now gone even farther in reverse: they have not even mentioned a revolutionary provisional government. Why? On what grounds? In what respect have their views changed? All this remains a mystery. Instead of developing tactical directives, the Mensheviks' conferences merely provide exhibitions of plunges and vacillations now to the right, now to the left. ²⁴

The Russian people are getting their first little lessons in constitutionalism. All these laws on the elections of popular representatives are not worth a brass farthing until the sovereignty of the people has actually been won ²⁵

The resolution's only definition of the nature of these "comprehensive democratic organisations" consists of a statement of the two aims set them: 1) a struggle against the State Duma, and 2) a struggle for a popular constituent assembly. The latter aim, as lamely formulated by *Iskra*, i.e., without any indication of who is to convene the popular constituent assembly, has been fully endorsed by the Constitutional-Democrats.

5. Finally, we reach the main task of this "all-Russian people's organisation"—the organisation of nation-wide popular elections to a constituent assembly. Nation-wide popular elections with the autocracy left intact! And "clashes" with the autocracy provide "new incentives for an uprising".... Mock elections as a new incentive for an uprising: is what this amounts to!

The slogan calling for "revolutionary self-government", and the theory of the "spontaneous generation" of a constituent assembly could not but lead to this absurdity, which is destined to become classical. To speak of nation-wide popular elections under the rule of the Trepovs, i.e., before the victory of the uprising, before the actual overthrow of the tsarist government, is the height of Manilovism, and can serve only to spread incredible political corruption among the workers. Only people attuned to phrasemongering by the new *Iskra* can accept such slogans, which crumble to dust at the merest contact with sober criticism. One has only to reflect a little on precisely what is meant by nation-wide popular elections, if the term be taken seriously: one has only to remember that they imply freedom of agitation, keeping the entire population informed, and recognition by the entire population of the centre or local centres that will register the entire population, and canvass literally everyone, with no exceptions—one has only to give such things a little thought to realise that the "nation-wide popular elections" proposed by *Iskra* would amount to a nation-wide joke or a nation-wide swindle. Not a single deputy who could claim to have been "elected by the entire people", i.e., who has had 50,000 to 100,000 votes freely and consciously cast for him—not one such deputy can be elected anywhere in Russia "in the inauguration of the election campaign". 26

DEMOCRATIC TASKS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PROLETARIAT

What is a "popular Constituent" Assembly? It is an assembly which, in the first place, really expresses the will of the people. To this end we must have universal suffrage in all of its democratic aspects, and a full guarantee of freedom to conduct the election campaign. It is an assembly which, in the second place, *really has the power and authority to "inaugurate" a political order which will ensure the sovereignty of the people.* It is clear as daylight that without these two conditions the assembly can be neither truly popular nor truly constituent. Yet our liberal bourgeois, our constitutional monarchists (whose claim to be democrats is a mockery of the people) do not want real safeguards to ensure *either* of these conditions! Not only do they fail to ensure in any way complete freedom of election propaganda or the actual transfer of power and authority to the Constituent Assembly, but, on the contrary, *they seek to make both impossible since they aim at maintaining the monarchy.* The real power and authority is to remain in the hands of Nicholas the Bloody. This means that the dire enemy of the people is to convene the assembly and "ensure" that the elections will be free and universal. How very democratic! It means that the Constituent Assembly will never have and (according to the idea of the liberal bourgeois) must never have all power and all authority; it is to be utterly devoid of power, devoid of authority; it is merely *to come to terms, to reach an agreement, to arrive at an understanding, to strike a bargain with Nicholas II* for the assembly to be granted a modicum of his royal power! The Constituent Assembly elected by universal suffrage is to differ in no way from a Lower House. That is to say, the Constituent Assembly, convened for expressing and executing the will of the people, is designed by the liberal bourgeoisie to "constitute", *over the will of the people, the will of an Upper House* and on top of that the will of the monarchy, the will of Nicholas.

Is it not obvious that in talking, speechifying, and shouting about a popular Constituent Assembly, the liberal bourgeois, the *Osvobodivshiesya* gentry, are actually planning an *anti-popular consultative* assembly? Instead of emancipating the people, they want to subject the people, by constitutional means, first, to the power of the tsar (monarchism), and, secondly, to the power of the organised big bourgeoisie (the Upper House).

If anyone wishes to dispute this conclusion, let him assert: (1) that there can be a true expression of the popular will in elections without complete freedom of propaganda and without the actual abolition of all the propaganda privileges of the tsarist government; or (2) that an assembly of delegates devoid of real power and authority, in that these are left in the hands of the tsar, is not, in effect, a mere consultative body. To make either of these assertions one must be either a brazen charlatan or a hopeless fool. History proves conclusively that a representative assembly coexisting with a monarchical form of government is in actual fact, so long as governmental power remains in the hands of the monarchy, a consultative body which does not bend the will of the monarch to the will of the people, but only conforms the will of the people to the will of the monarch, i.e., divides the power between monarch and people, bargains for a new order, but does not constitute it. History proves conclusively that there can be no such thing as really free elections, that the significance and character of these elections can hardly be brought home to the whole people unless the government that is combating the revolution is replaced by a provisional revolutionary government. Granting for a moment the improbable and the impossible, namely, that the tsarist government, having decided to convene a "Constituent" (read: consultative) Assembly, will give formal guarantees of freedom of propaganda, all the vast advantages and superior facilities for campaigning which accrue from the organised power of the state will nevertheless remain in its hands. These advantages and facilities for propaganda during the elections to the first people's assembly will be enjoyed by the very ones who have oppressed the people by all the means in their power, and from whom the people have begun to wrest liberty by force.

In a word, we arrive at the very conclusion we reached on the previous occasion (*Proletary*, No. 3),* when we examined this question from another angle. The slogan of a popular Constituent Assembly, taken by itself, separately, is at the present time a slogan of the monarchist bourgeoisie, a slogan calling for a deal between the bourgeoisie and the tsarist government. Only the overthrow of the tsarist government and its replacement by a provisional revolutionary government, whose duty it will be to convene the popular Constituent Assembly, can be the slogan of the revolutionary struggle. Let the proletariat of Russia have no illusions on this score; in the din of the general excitation it is being deceived by the use of its own slogans. If we fail to match the armed force of the government with the force of an armed people, if the tsarist government is not utterly defeated and replaced by a provisional revolutionary government, every representative assembly, whatever title—"popular", "constituent", etc.—may be conferred upon it, will in fact be an assembly of representatives of the big bourgeoisie convened for the purpose of bargaining with the tsar for a division of power.

The more the people's struggle against the tsar comes to a head and the greater likelihood there is of a speedy realisation of the demand for an assembly of people's representatives, the more closely must the revolutionary proletariat watch the "democratic" bourgeoisie. The sooner we gain freedom, the sooner will this ally of the proletariat become its enemy. Two circumstances will serve to cloak this change: (1) the vagueness, incompleteness, and non-committal character of the would-be democratic slogans of the bourgeoisie; and (2) the endeavour to turn the slogans of the proletariat into mere phrases, to substitute empty promises for real safeguards of liberty and revolution. The workers must now watch the "democrats" with intensified vigilance. The words "popular Constituent Assembly" will be nothing more than words if, owing to the actual conditions under which the election campaign and the elections themselves are conducted, this assembly fails to express the will of the people, if it lacks the strength independently to establish the new order.27

While quite correctly condemning a passive boycott, the *Iskra* contraposes to it the idea of the immediate "organisation of revolutionary self-government bodies", as a "possible prologue to an uprising". In *Iskra's* opinion we must "seize the right to carry on agitation in the election campaign by establishing workers' agitation committees". These committees "must set themselves the aim of organising popular elections of revolutionary deputies by going outside the 'legal' limits which will be established by Ministerial Bills", we must "cover the country with a network of revolutionary self-government bodies".

Such a slogan is absolutely useless. Viewed in the light of the political tasks in general it is a jumble, while in the light of the immediate political situation it brings grist to the mill of the *Osvobozhdeniye* trend. The organisation of revolutionary self-government, the election of their own deputies by the people is not the prologue to an uprising, but its epilogue. To attempt to bring about this organisation now, before an uprising and apart from an uprising, means setting oneself absurd aims and causing confusion in the minds of the revolutionary proletariat. It is first of all necessary to win the victory in an uprising (if only in a single city) and to establish a provisional revolutionary government, so that the latter, as the organ of the uprising and the recognised leader of the revolutionary people, should be able to get down to the organisation of revolutionary self-government. To obscure the slogan of insurrection or relegate it into the background by proposing a slogan demanding the organisation of a revolutionary self-government is something like giving advice that the fly should first be caught and then stuck on the fly-paper. If during the celebrated Odessa events our Odessa comrades had been advised to organise not a revolutionary army, but the election of deputies by the people of Odessa as a prologue to an uprising, those comrades would undoubtedly have laughed such advice to scorn. *Iskra* is repeating the mistake made by the Economists, who wished to see in the "struggle for rights" a prologue to the struggle against the autocracy. *Iskra* is reverting to the misadventure of the unfortunate "plan of the Zemstvo campaign", which obscured the slogan of insurrection with the theory of a "higher type of demonstration".

This is not the place to dwell on the origin of *Iskra's* tactical blunder. We shall refer the interested reader to N. Lenin's pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. It is more important here to point out how the slogan of the new *Iskra* lapses into that of *Osvobozhdeniye*. In actual practice attempts to organise popular elections of deputies before the uprising is victorious would only play into the hands of the *Osvobozhdeniye* people with the result that the Social-Democrats would be trailing behind them. Until replaced by a provisional revolutionary government the autocracy will not permit the workers and the people to conduct any elections that can in any way be called popular (and Social-Democrats will not agree to a travesty of "popular" elections under the autocracy); but the *Osvobozhdeniye* League, Zemstvo members and the municipal councillors will conduct elections and blatantly pass them off as "popular", and as an expression of "revolutionary self-government". The line now taken by the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie consists in trying to avert an uprising, compel the autocracy to recognise the Zemstvo elections as popular elections without the people's victory over tsarism and convert the Zemstvo and municipal self-government bodies into organs of "revolutionary" (in the Petrunkevich sense) "self-government", without a real revolution. An excellent expression of this line is to be found in No. 74 of *Osvobozhdeniye*. It would be hard to imagine anything more disgusting than this ideologist of the cowardly bourgeoisie, who asserts that advocacy of insurrection "demoralises" both the army and the people! And this is said at a time when even the blind can see that it is only through an uprising that the ordinary Russian citizen and soldier can save himself from utter demoralisation and vindicate his right to citizenship! The bourgeois Manilov pictures to himself an Arcadian idyll in which the mere pressure of "public opinion" alone "will compel the government to make concession after concession, until finally it can go no further and will have to hand over the power to a constituent assembly elected on the basis of universal and equal suffrage, direct elections, and a secret ballot, as is demanded by society ..." (! with an upper chamber?). "There is nothing at all improbable in this peaceful [!] transition of power from the present government to a national constituent assembly, which will organise state and governmental power on a new basis." And this masterly philosophy of the cringing bourgeoisie is rounded off with the advice that the army, particularly the officers, should be won over; that a people's militia be established "without official authorisa-

tion", and that local self-government bodies (read: of landlords and capitalists) should be set up as "elements of a future provisional government".

There is method in *this* muddle. What the bourgeoisie wants is to be given power "peacefully", without a popular uprising, which may prove victorious, win a republic and genuine liberty, arm the proletariat, and rouse millions of peasants. To obscure the slogan of insurrection, to abandon it and make others follow suit, to advise the immediate establishment, by way of a "prologue", of popular self-government (to which only the Trubetskois, Petrunkeviches, Fyodorovs, and the like will be admitted)—that is what the bourgeoisie needs in order to betray the revolution and strike a bargain with the tsar (a monarchy with an upper chamber) *against* the "mob". Liberal Manilovism, therefore, voices the innermost thoughts of the money-bags, their most profound interests.

Ishra's Social-Democratic Manilovism expressed merely the thoughtlessness of a section of the Social-Democrats, their departure from the proletariat's only revolutionary tactics, viz., ruthless exposure of the bourgeois-opportunist illusions that peaceful concessions from tsarism are possible, that popular self-government can be instituted without the autocracy being overthrown, and that election of deputies by the people is possible as a prologue to an uprising. No, we must clearly and resolutely show the necessity of an insurrection in the present state of affairs; we must issue a direct call for an uprising (without, of course, fixing the date beforehand) and call for the immediate organisation of a revolutionary army. Only the boldest and most widespread organisation of such an army can be the prologue to an uprising. Only an uprising can actually guarantee the victory of the revolution; of course, those who know the local conditions will always caution against attempts at a premature uprising. The real organisation of real people's self-government can take place only as the epilogue of a victorious uprising. 28

The entire question of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship hinges on the complete overthrow of the autocracy. Possibly the history of 1848-50 will repeat itself with us, that is, the autocracy will not be overthrown but only limited in power and converted into a constitutional monarchy. In that case a democratic dictatorship will be out of the question. If, however, the autocratic government is really overthrown, it will have to be replaced by another. This other can be only a provisional revolutionary government. It can base itself for support only on the revolutionary people—on the proletariat and the peasantry. It can be only a dictatorship, that is, not an organisation of "order", but an organisation of war. If you are storming a fortress, you cannot discontinue the war even after you have taken the fortress. Either the one or the other: either we take the fortress to hold it, or we do not storm the fortress and explain that all we want is a little place next to it.

— — —
**NO FALSEHOOD!
OUR STRENGTH LIES IN STATING THE TRUTH!**

LETTER TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD 104

"We are not strong enough to launch an uprising ... therefore there is no point in linking it up with the Duma ... a constituent assembly should be the battle-cry of our agitation." That is what the Bund wrote, and no adequate reply was provided by the author of the article in No. 16.*

These words of the Bund's are an excellent reflection of *philistinism* within the Social-Democratic movement, *philistinism* in the sense of banality, the golden mean, insipidity, generalities, mediocrity (qualities that have always been characteristic of the Bund, which, as is known, played the part of an ideological parasite in 1897-1900, in 1901-03, in 1904, and now in 1905).

That is the current view, the commonly accepted standpoint, "common sense" ("the triumph of common sense" in *O s v o b o z h d e n i y e* and "seeing the light").

This is a tremendous *falsehood*, the exposure of which is of the utmost import to the Russian revolution and to the class-conscious proletariat, as the *only* possible creator of a *victorious revolution*.

We are not strong enough to launch an uprising; *therefore* we should not link it up with anything; *therefore* the slogan must not call for an armed uprising, but for a constituent assembly.

It is just like saying: "Naked and unfortunate, hungry and tormented, we are unable to emerge from the swamp in which

we are perishing, and ascend to the mountain top where there is light and sunshine, clean air and all the fruits of the earth. We have no ladder, and without it we cannot ascend. We are unable to acquire a ladder. Therefore we should not link up our struggle for an ascent with the slogan of obtaining (*respective*, making) a ladder. Therefore our slogan should be 'To the mountain top, to the mountain top: there happiness and deliverance, air and light, new spirit and vigour await us'."

Since there is no ladder, without which an ascent is impossible—therefore you should not make the acquisition of a ladder your slogan, and work on making one—therefore the slogan should be: "Get to the summit; to the mountain top, there happiness, etc., await you!"

"As ever, weakness had taken refuge in a belief in miracles," as Marx said!¹⁰⁵

Is it the weakness of the proletariat, or the *weak thinking* of the Bund and the new *Iskra* that is now taking refuge in a belief in miracles, in the belief that the mountain can be scaled without a ladder, in the belief that a constituent assembly is possible without an uprising?

Such belief is that of the insane. Without an armed uprising a constituent assembly is a phantasm, a phrase, a lie, a Frankfurt talking shop.

The deceit and falsity of the *Osvobozhdeniye* trend, of that *first bourgeois slogan* in Russia to assume a broadly political, mass-political, popular form, consist in that very support of a belief in miracles, in the support of that lie. For the liberal bourgeoisie needs the lie, since to it that is no lie, but the greatest of truths, the truth of its class interests, the truth of bourgeois liberty, the truth of capitalist equality, the holy of holies of the huckster fraternity.

This is its (the bourgeoisie's) truth, for what it needs is not the victory of the people, or the *mountain top* but a swamp for the masses; it wants the bosses and money-bags to be seated on the backs of the common people; it needs not a victory, but a deal, a *compromise* with the enemy—a sell-out to the enemy.

For the bourgeoisie this is no "miracle", but reality, the reality of treason to the revolution, not of the victory of the revolution.

"...We are not strong enough to acquire a ladder ... we are not strong enough to launch an uprising." Is that the case, gentlemen?

If that is the case, then recast *all* your propaganda and agitation, begin to speak to the workers and the entire people in *new* and different words, in language framed in a new and different way.

Tell the people: workers of St. Petersburg, Riga, Warsaw, Odessa, Tiflis ... we are not strong enough to launch a rising and be victorious in a rising. Therefore there is *no point* in thinking, no point in vain talking about a *popular constituent assembly*. Don't debase grand words with petty subterfuges. Don't cover up your weakness with a belief in miracles. Proclaim your weakness aloud to one and all—a fault confessed is half redressed. False rhetoric and false boastfulness spell moral ruin and lead unfailingly to political extinction.

Workers! We are too weak to bring about an uprising and win victory in one! Therefore stop all talk about a popular constituent assembly, drive away those liars who speak about it, expose the treachery of the *Osvobozhdeniye* gentry, the "Duma enthusiasts", the Constitutional-Democrats, and the rest of the vile crew, for it is only *in word* that they want a popular constituent assembly; actually they want an assembly directed against the people, one that will not constitute anything new, but will merely patch up the old, one that will not give you new garments, a new life, a new weapon for the great new struggle, but will give you only tinsel over your old rags, only mirages and deceptions, popguns instead of rifles and chains instead of weapons.

Workers! We are too weak for an uprising. Therefore, do not talk and do not let the *Osvobozhdeniye* prostitutes, the Constitutional-Democrats, and Duma supporters talk of a revolution; do not allow those bourgeois scoundrels to sully a great popular concept with their claptrap.

We are weak? That means that we have no revolution, nor can there be one. That is not a revolution of the people, but swindling of the people by the Petrunkeviches and a pack of liberal lackeys of the tsar. That is not a struggle for liberty, but a bartering away of the people's freedom in exchange for parliamentary seats for the *Osvobozhdeniye*. 29

Quotations from:

1. Lenin, Coll. Works, Vol.8
p.492-493
2. ibid. p.299
3. ibid. p. 301-2
4. Lenin, CW. Vol.10 p.67
5. Lenin, CW. Vol.9 p.26
6. ibid. p.33
7. ibid. p.36-7
8. ibid. p. 45
9. ibid. p. 55-6
10. ibid. p. 61
11. ibid. p. 183
12. ibid. p. 47
13. ibid. p. 77
14. ibid. p. 113
15. ibid. p. 221
16. ibid. p. 131-2
17. ibid. p. 197-8
18. ibid. p. 173
19. ibid. p. 279
20. ibid. p. 272
21. ibid. p. 249
22. ibid. p. 225
23. ibid. p. 463
24. ibid. p. 358-9
25. ibid. p. 195
26. ibid. p. 364-5
27. Lenin CW. Vol.8. p.515-17
28. Lenin CW. Vol.9 p. 184-87
29. ibid. p.295-97.

ግብባቢያ

ውድ አንባቢያችንን

የወጭውን ንቅናቄ ከውስጥ ሆኖ በርብርብ ለማግኘት ያደረገው ጭብራ ስላልተባባሰ አራቱን ከንቅናቄያችን ያገለለው ፀረ ሕዝብ ቡድን ከቅርብ ጊዜ ጀምሮ፣ ከአሥር ዓመት በላይ በፊው ሕዝብ ጉን በመሰለፍ ያለማድረግና ያለመታከት ፀረ ኢምፒሪያሊስትና ፀረ ፈውሳሊስት ተገላ ሲያስፈልግ በኖረው ጥህትና በነዚህ ሀዘ አባር ዓመታት ያለተሰጠውን ነፃነት በመገመቱ የበፊውን ሕዝብ ድምፅና ተገላ ሲያስተጋቡ በኖረቱ ከየትኛውም የተማሪ ጥህትና ጭንቀት በላይ የበፊው ሕዝብ ጥበቃና ጥበቃ ሆነው በቀዳሚ በተጠቀሱ በተገለጹን ሰዎች መካከል ይገኛል፡፡ የዚህ ፀረ ሕዝብ ቡድን ዓላማ ጥህትና ለንግሥት ተጠቅሞ ተገለጾ በአባር ዓመት የራሱ ተገላ ባተረፈ በሰዎች ጭንቀት ፀረ ሕዝብ ፖለቲካውን ለመሸፈን ነው፡፡ ለንግሥት ከውስጥ ሆኖ ያቃተውን የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪያችና ተራማጆች አገልግሎት የማፋለስ ጭንቀት ከውጭ ሆኖ ወደባብር በመገዛት ለማፋፋት ነው፡፡ ይህም አገልግሎት የተረጋገጠ ነው፡፡ ለማንኛውም የተለመደውን የጭንቀት አዘጋጅ ቦርድ አዲሲ / ጣለት P.O.BOX 3198; 10364 STOCKHOLM ; S W E D E N ያለያዙት የዓለም አቀፍ የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪያች ጥህትና አባላትን የማይቃረኑ ገን የጥህትና ጭንቀት ሰዎች የያዙ ጭንቀት ወዘተ በአውሮፓ የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪያች ጥህትና ጭንቀት አለመሆኑን ለንግሥትና ለንግሥት ተቃራኒ አገልግሎት ያለ፡፡ ለእነዚህ ለይነት ጭንቀት ተጠያቂው "ዓለም አቀፍ ፌዴራሊዝም" በሚባል ሰዎች የታወቀው የነ ለበፊው ሰዎች — ጭንቀት ሆኖ የወጣቸው ድርጅት ነው፡፡

ከፋፋዊና አወናባጆች ከፊውሳሊዝምና ኢምፒሪያሊዝም ጋር ይወደዳል!
የእውነተኛ አብዮታዊያንና ተራማጆች አገልግሎት ይሄ!
ድህ የበፊው ሕዝብ ነው!

በአካላዊ የጭንቀት አዘጋጅ ቦርድ