



ትግላችን ዜና

በአውሮፓ የኢትዮጵያ ተማሪዎች ግህበር የተከጋጀ

Prepared by the Ethiopian Students Union
in Europe

Vol.2. No.3

P.O.Box 3198, 10364 Stockholm 3 SWEDEN

--The Political Bankruptcy

of "Acherghuzoism" — — —

— አድርገዋል

« ሊያጋልጡን... » —

Megabit 1967

March 1975

FOREWARD

The February mass movement in Ethiopia has brought to the surface two irreconcilable differences within the Ethiopian students movement.

Our phoney revolutionists grouped around "COMBAT", "TAGEL", "PROLETARIAT" etc. who "devote more effort to learning by heart and committing to memory revolutionary slogans than to thinking them out" have proved to be totally crippled and helpless in face of the actual struggle of the Ethiopian peoples.

Out of the few "political" literatures they manage to put out, three-fourth is devoted to heaping abuses, unfounded rumours and slanders on some individuals in particular and the whole of the revolutionary wing of our movement in general. These methods of struggle covered with marxist phraseology, apparently employed as a means to conceal their bankruptcy and utter ignorance of revolutionary theories, has betrayed the objectively counter-revolutionary role they play in the struggle of the Ethiopian peoples against feudalism and imperialism.

The hip of rubbish they print, which disdainfully brushes aside questions of paramount importance to our struggle, has proved to be nothing but mere bubble of disunity and disruption.

Petty-bourgeois sensationalism, brainlessness, phrasemongering and boastfulness are its main characteristics. COMBAT Vol. II No. 4 Nov. 74 is an illustrative example. In this publication the ESUNA leaders detached from reality and devoid of all revolutionary theories, have exposed their total blindness to the objective situation in Ethiopia.

The purpose of this issue is to disclose the true nature of the pseudo-revolutionists in our movement and also an attempt to present a sober analysis of the objective situation in Ethiopia taken with all its complex links and contradictions.

How does the ESUNA leadership quote?

The ESUNA leadership doesn't show the slightest intellectual honesty and revolutionary sincerity in its polemics, that it doesn't even shrink from fabricating quotations and attribute them to its opponents.

For example, in Combat they write:

"The point is do you support the popular provisional government which CELU in its most path-breaking resolution advocated or do you still insist that the non-unionized sector of the proletariat represents 'the most courageous, the most prepared for the struggle and the most class conscious'. (Tatek, p. 53)"

Nowhere did we ever write in Tatek that the non-unionized proletariat is the most courageous and class conscious - this is a pure lie and fabrication of the ESUNA leadership. This is not how a revolutionary carries on ideological struggles, but is the method of a downright thug - and the above is not the only example! Furthermore, the ESUNA leadership has flowered its tirade against ESUE with a number of quotations from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, but none of these quotations - not even a single one - has been relevantly cited and fits correctly. The abuse of the writings of Marx and Lenin, is a practice introduced by the infamous Bulletin in our movement, with the intent to consistently emasculate Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary spirit and scientific character. This charlatan practice of abusing quotations from the works of Marxism-Leninism, is also one of the glaring moments of the ESUNA leadership. Let's illustrate this by the following example as stated in Combat.

"How come the unorganized proletariat became suddenly 'class conscious'? Is it because it is free from the organizing influence of CELU? You muddled heads of disordered petty-bourgeois class stand know no bound! Let us close the point by an instructive remark from Lenin.

'...because of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary character of the top leadership, they jump to the conclusion that ... we must leave the trade union! That we must refuse to work in them! We must create new and artificial forms of labor-organisations. This is such an unpardonable blunder that is equal to the greatest service (to) the bourgeoisie.' "

Poor ESUNA leadership does not only not know what it is quoting, but has also no idea of what Lenin was talking about. In the first place, nobody in the Ethiopian Students Movement ever talked of leaving the trade unions and refusing to work in them. This is a question that never arose and can never arise within a student movement. Let's have first this point clear. Secondly, Lenin was in his article "Left-wing Communism - an infantile disorder" polemicizing against an anarchist tendency in the world workers' movement, which in view of the renegade trade union bureaucracy and as a result of many setbacks in trade union work, declined to work in reactionary trade unions and started calling upon the workers to leave the reactionary unions and form revolutionary labor organization. A classic example of such an anarchist tendency was the Communist Workers Party of Germany (which split from the CPG), against which the Comintern carried on a consistent ideological struggle. But this is all brand new to the ESUNA leadership, which does not know what's quoting, and has no scruples in distorting and abusing Marxism-Leninism so long it suits its purposes.

Questions of Class analysis

The Acher-Guzoist ESUNA leadership accuses ESUE of having a false notion of class analysis and amid results suggests that we go back to the elementary school of class analysis. However in view of its performance in this field, we mean that a little bit of modesty would do the Acher Guzoists no harm. For sure one of us will have to revise his methods of class analysis, and soon we hope to know who. - But first to the subject matter. -

It is evident that a clear understanding of the class composition of Ethiopian society and the inter-relationship of these classes is of decisive importance for the success of the revolutionary struggle. Only on the basis of a scientific class analysis can one map out correct tactics and strategies for every given stage of the revolution. The essence of any class analysis is to determine the economic position of the different classes in a historically given system of production (1) and from this deduce their attitude towards the revolution (2). It is only on the basis of the knowledge obtained by such an analysis - of course liable and subjection to correction by revolutionary practice - that we can be able to distinguish the "real friends" from the "real enemies". It was on the basis of such an analysis and the Marxist definition of a class that our movement established the motive forces as well as the enemies (targets) of the new democratic revolution. These generally accepted truths have been recently thrown overboard by the ESUNA leadership to be replaced by vulgar conceptions of a class and the class struggle when it writes:

"If we agree that a class is an economic, historical and social group bound together by a common relation to the means of production, if a class is not a legal or moral category, (it is also a legal/moral category! TZ), but a social, historical, and economic category, if a class is a socio-economic and historical association (false! A class is no association! TZ) without a precise definition and organization in statutes and regulations (irrelevant! TZ), if its existence is not legal but objective (are not legal things objective! TZ), if enacted laws respond (you mean correspond! TZ) to class interest favoring the dominant economic and social classes, if institutions, such as the state apparatus, bureaucratic, military and ideological (ideology is no institution! TZ) respond in the interest of the ruling classes, if the common action of the classes (??? TZ) is an unconscious product reflecting their relationship to the means of production (??? TZ), then there can be only one ruling class in Ethiopia. (Goodbye, logic! TZ)"

In the first place the definition of a class given by the ESUNA has grave errors. Among others, its principal errors are:

- 1) It does not presuppose those modes of production based on the exploitation of man by man but merely talks of the historicity of classes abstractly, which inevitably would include those historical periods of classless societies. Classes don't exist in all historical periods (ex. Communist) but are bound to specific modes of production.
- 2) It fails to define the relationship of the different classes to the means of production as property relations.
- 3) It ignores the crucial role of classes in the organization of labor which is an indispensable part of any class definition.
- 4) It talks of the common action of classes induced by the relationship to the means of production which is not only absolutely false but also reactionary. Only a renegade would talk of the common action between the exploited and exploiter.

One may say that with the exception of the first phrase, the definition of a class given by the Acher-Guzoists is both insufficiently formulated and erroneous. Let us now go over and give on our part the scientific definition of classes (which has been thoroughly expounded in Tatak No. 1 Tekemt 1967) as formulated by Lenin. In his article "The Great Beginning", Lenin defines classes as a large aggregate of people, that differ from each other according to their position in a historically determined system of production, and their relationship (Lenin says to a large extent codified) to the means of production - i.e. as property relationships. Furthermore, classes are assorted according to their role in the social organization of labor, and their share in the social wealth as the methods of acquiring it. In other words "classes are a group of people one of which can appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."

Not having it enough in giving us an erroneous definition of classes, the ESUNA leadership tries to deduce from this definition that there can be only one ruling class in Ethiopia. Let us look back again at the above quotation and see how they accomplish this masterpiece.

"...if institutions such as the state apparatus... respond in the interest of the ruling class, if the common action of the classes is an unconscious product reflecting their relationship to the means of production, then there can be only one ruling class in Ethiopia."

The position of the ESUNA leadership that there can be only one ruling class is not only illogically deduced but also does not correspond to the reality in Ethiopia. We say illogical because the fact of having only one ruling class cannot at all be deduced from the mere definition of a class - from the characteristics of a class one cannot therefore conclude that there can only be a single ruling class. This is a ridiculous absurdity. Before teaching logic to others, the ESUNA leadership had better know what logic is in the first place. Moreover, in the above quoted (we call upon readers to look at it carefully) the ESUNA leadership in one phrase of ruling classes (in the plural) and only a phrase later concludes that there can only be one ruling class (in the singular) in Ethiopia. Believe it or not, this is the sort of nonsense our union had to deal with for the last two years!

On the empirical plane, anybody acquainted with the political reality in Ethiopia knows very well that the contention that there was only one ruling ^{class} in Ethiopia (before the military took over) does not correspond to reality. As a matter of fact, anybody who talks of contradictions in the ruling classes in Ethiopia and oversees the class differences and struggles between the bureaucratic capitalists and feudalists has in reality no idea of what he is talking about - which is often the case with the ESUNA leadership.

When we say the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the feudal class constitute the ruling classes in Ethiopia, the class differences between these two are not artificial or arbitrarily constituted but correspond to the objective reality. The fundamental differentiating characteristics of both classes can be summed up as follows.

The feudal class.

- 1) Is the main class of the disintegrating feudal mode of production, with its power constantly eroding.
- 2) The economic base of its power is the monopoly of land.
- 3) It appropriates the surplus product of the peasantry.
- 4) Its political order is based on a system of hierarchy and rank.

The bureaucratic bourgeoisie.

- 1) Came into being with the penetration of imperialism in Ethiopia and the effort to centralize Ethiopia.
- 2) It derives its power from its function in the state apparatus - and not from its role in the sphere of production.
- 3) It receives its income as a result of the redivision of the produced surplus product and value via taxes, corruption, etc.
- 4) It is the vector of fascism.

The relationship between the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the feudal class can be characterized as follows:

The feudal class needs the bureaucratic bourgeoisie in order to rule, to run the state machinery for it, and to this effect must share power with it. The bureaucratic bourgeoisie on the other hand does not need the feudal class in order to rule and need not share power with it. - The recent experience confirms this. In Ethiopia, the feudal class has been removed from political power while the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, although badly affected, has still its share of power.

Historically speaking, in societies like Ethiopia that are in a process of transition from feudalism to capitalism and the democratic revolution has not yet taken place or has been aborted, we often have a coalition of the feudalist and capitalist classes sharing state power - corresponding to the semi-feudal and semi-capitalist character of the economic base. In England for example, the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie formed a coalition that ruled England for about 150 years, until the reform bill of 1832 finally did away with the feudal nobility. Bismark's Prussia and Russia between 1905 - 1917 are classic examples of coalition and compromises between the feudal lords and the capitalists. In the countries of the third world, where, due to imperialism we have an

inflated bureaucracy, the bureaucratic bourgeoisie has important say in ruling the people and exercises control over the state apparatus. To sum up, in societies that are in a period of transition from feudalism to capitalism, it occurs more than often that we have a coalition of ruling classes - and that, despite the contrary assertions of the ESUNA leadership.

Who is the proletariat in present day Ethiopian society?

With the rise of capitalist relations, we have the birth of the proletariat in Ethiopia. It is a class which is forced to sell its labor power to the capitalist in order to exist and as such is the direct producer in the capitalist sphere of production. The working class produces the surplus value which is appropriated by the capitalist class - a process which characterizes the capitalist mode of production. In Ethiopia, the working class is primarily engaged in the manufacturing, transport, building and mining industries. The agricultural proletariat which is engaged on commercial farms is also a part of this class. In marxist terminology, the terms proletariat and working class are interchangeable. The term 'proletariat' describes the condition of social exploitation, political oppression and ideological suppression in the capitalist sector of production.

The friends in Algeria (who by the way, are now more than a half a decade abroad) think the scientific definition of the proletariat given by ESUE is inappropriate, and jumping in the fray, they try to annihilate the ESUE 'Orthodoxists' (debteras) with the following:-

"In their report to the 14th. congress they (ESUE) have attempted an odd type of class definition. On their semantic game they tried to explain that the proletariat only meant an industrial worker. But all philology (you mean ethymology? - TZ) tells us that 'proletariat' means a social class occupying the lowest rung of the social ladder. In any given socio-economic formation, it could be applied to the lowest and poorest class then existing depending upon the mode of production characterizing the society in a given period. In a capitalist society, it is the industrial wage labor whom we have as the proletariat. In a semi-feudal and neo-colonial society the social composition of this can be diverse, which include the town slum dwellers, the migrant peasant or the seasonal worker seen

at the construction site, the semi-peasant worker on a commercial farm, the full time employee of the factories, workshops, maintenance and repair firms, transportation workers, groceries, hotels, the miner, the private soldier and students below University level who on finishing high school get thrown to the rank of the city roving non employee or gets employed as a soldier." (p.23/24) (The Present situation in Ethiopia.)

The term 'proletariat' is of Latin origin and was used in ancient Rome to mean the free poor (as distinct from the slave) that lived in the Cities. It was a proletariat that did not sell its labor power in order to exist, nor was it engaged in any sort of economic activity worthy of the name, but simply lived parasitically at the expense of the rich and on the free grain distributions of the state. Eighteen hundred years later, Marx and Engels used this term - in view of its oppressive and inhuman conditions - to mean the working class in capitalist society.

"In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e. capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed - a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and also find work only so long as their labor increases capital." (Communist Manifesto)

Further,

"By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labor. By proletariat, the class of modern wage laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor power in order to live." (Communist Manifesto) - Emphasis ours.

Engels, in his draft notes for the "Communist Manifesto" which is better known as "Principle of Communism" defines the proletariat, and attempts to distinguish it from other laboring classes as follows.

"Question 2. What is the proletariat?

Answer: The proletariat is that class of society which procures its means of livelihood entirely and solely from the sale of its labour and not from the period derived from some capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence depend on the demand for

labour, hence, on the alternations of times of good business and times of bad business, on the fluctuations resulting from unbidden competition. The proletariat, or class of proletarians, is, in a word, the working class of the nineteenth century.

Question 3. Thus, have there not always been proletarians?

Answer: No. Poor folk and working classes have always existed, and the working classes have for the most part have been poor. But such poor, such workers who lived under the just mentioned conditions, that is, proletarians, have not always existed, any more than competition has always been free and unbidden."

The word proletariat in Ethiopia has no other meaning than the working class engaged in the capitalist sector of production. All attempts to give it another sense is nothing but reactionary petty-fogging - to smuggle alien elements into the ranks of the proletariat. According to one vulgar sociologist in Algeria, the proletariat is not only the working class engaged in the capitalist sector of production but also includes from slum-dwellers, clerks, soldiers, students (their friends in Holland also tell us that teachers are part of the proletariat!). Let us see what this means. In Ethiopia, the greater part of the urban areas is composed of slums. Of the people that live in these slums (perhaps with the exception of industrial towns like Addis Ababa) a small percent consists of workers, while another part is composed of government employees with middle and low incomes. The far greater majority of the urban slum dwellers is composed of peasants that have fled the countryside, prostitutes, beggars, lumpen elements, etc... Thus we see that in Ethiopia although great deal of the Ethiopian proletariat lives in town slums, not all slum-dwellers belong to the proletariat as our vulgar sociologists maintain. The vulgar sociologists in Algeria define the class of proletariat not according to its relation to the capitalist means of production, but according to the town areas it lives in. Marx defined those dwellers in the city slums, who are not engaged in the sphere of production as the lumpenproletariat. In the "Class struggles in France" Marx says that the Lumpenproletariat, is

"in all great cities, a mass clearly differentiated from the proletariat". In the '18th Brumaire', Marx enumerates the mosaic characters that belong to the "People without a certain profession"; the lumpenproletariat:

"Vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, swindlers, lazzaroni, (declassed elements, TZ), pick-pockets, tricksters, gamblers, maquereans, brothel keepers, porters, literate, beggars - in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French term la bohème - (p. 442)

All this degenerate elements who dwell in the slums of the towns in Ethiopia and occupy the lowest social ladder are according to our friends in Algeria part of the proletariat. Furthermore, we have the ridiculous contention that high school students belong to the proletariat. No wonder these right opportunists tell us the proletariat led the February movement, a question to which we will turn our attention now.

Who led the February movement?

One of our differences with the right-opportunist wing of our movement concerns the question: 'who led the February movement?' - This question is of uttermost significance since the outcome of the democratic revolution - its success - depends on the class leading it. It is our firm opinion, based on the objective reality in Ethiopia, that the February movement has been led by the petty-bourgeoisie, and it is the duty of the proletariat to struggle to attain the hegemony over the revolutionary movement in order to fully accomplish the tasks of the democratic revolution. But what are the conditions that would enable the proletariat to lead the democratic revolution? The 3rd party congress of the RSDLP (Bolshevik), which thoroughly dealt with this question states in its resolution.

"4. ... the proletariat can play the leading role in this revolution only if it is united in a single and independent political force under the banner of the

Social Democratic Labor Party, which directs its struggle both ideologically and practically."

In other words, according to the Bolsheviks, in order to lead the democratic revolution the working class must be first organized under its own communist party. Without a communist party, the proletariat would not be able to lead the democratic revolution, but rather follow the footsteps of the bourgeoisie/petty-bourgeoisie. Moreover, the formation of a communist party does not automatically make the working class the leader of the democratic revolution, but creates the possibility for it to be so. In order that this possibility be transformed into reality, - that the proletariat lead the revolutionary struggle - the following conditions, are according to Lenin indispensable. (See History of the CPSU)

1. It is necessary for the proletariat to win over the peasantry to its side as its ally - that the peasantry accepts the hegemony of the proletariat.

2. It is necessary that the proletariat struggle against the bourgeoisie/petty-bourgeoisie and dislodge it from its position as leader of the democratic revolution.

Only when the above conditions are fulfilled, can the proletariat lead the democratic revolution. To repeat, the role of leading the revolution does not fall in the lap of the proletariat from heaven, but that the proletariat must first be independently organized under its own party and then struggle for the hegemony of the revolution.

In Ethiopia under the conditions where the proletariat does not as yet have its party, it is not surprising that the petty-bourgeoisie did play the vanguard role in the February movement. As in most democratic revolutions in other countries, it was the petty-bourgeoisie, that first rolled the banner against imperialism and feudalism, and fought in the van against the two enemies of the Ethiopian peoples. In the last decade, it was the petty-bourgeoisie that articulated the needs of the Ethiopian peoples and gave its accent to their democratic demands. And

despite its vacillations, it was the petty-bourgeoisie, that during the February movement showed the perspective of struggle and gave it direction.

The petty-bourgeoisie is not, as the ESUNA leadership maintain, a class product of feudal dissolution (Combat p. 43) - this is absolutely false and sheer nonsense. On the contrary, it is a class that first comes into being with the rise and on the basis of capitalist relations of production - and thus in antagonism to feudalism. It is true that petty-bourgeoisie is a widely differentiated class - that it ranges between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie - but nevertheless stands together with the proletariat and bourgeoisie in contradiction to feudalism. The fact that the petty-bourgeoisie can never act in unison as a unitary class, does not hinder the advanced and revolutionary elements of the petty-bourgeoisie to fight in the forefront for its class interests - for the abolition of feudalism, for bourgeois democracy and the freest and widest development of commodity production.

Historically, it was the petty-bourgeoisie, as the radical representative of the newly propertied classes that first initiated and led the bourgeois democratic revolution in the city-states of Italy and won the republic. During the English Revolution of 1648 - it was the petty-bourgeoisie (the Levellers) that played an active role in giving the struggle a radical tenor. In the Great French Revolution, its moving spirit, leader and most revolutionary class was the radical petty-bourgeoisie (the Jacobins).

With the rise of world workers' socialist movement, and the transition to the epoch of proletarian revolutions, the bourgeoisie turned its back to the democratic revolution. This circumstance not only changes the character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the alignment of classes but also limits the role of the petty-bourgeoisie. Although it still more than often initiates the democratic struggle against imperialism and feudalism, it is no longer able to lead the struggle consistently to its end.

It fell upon the working class, in virtue of "being the foremost and only consistently revolutionary class" to lead it on to its conclusions. Here is the example of China quite illustrative. The 1911 Chinese revolution was led by the petty-bourgeoisie, which also had a ~~thurs~~ the proletariat in its following. The tasks of the Chinese democratic revolution were however really first resolved as the proletariat under the leadership of its CP attained the hegemony of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and carried it on to its new democratic stage. In Ethiopia too, it is only when the proletariat is organized under its party and wins the hegemony of the revolutionary movement, that the objective of the February movement be thoroughly resolved in a revolutionary way.

Let us see how the Acher Guzoists deal with this question. The Acher Guzoists, to a great extent children of stink-rich people (which is by the way nothing to be ashamed of, so long one brags with his past) but consider themselves as "born proletarians" (See Bulletin), are of the opinion the proletariat has led the February movement. According to Combat. -

"It was not the petty-bourgeois class which was at the forefront throughout the February upsurge. It was the proletariat and continues to be the proletariat. 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 breakaway university teachers' forum; (3) the university students union in Addis-Abeba, and the popular papers, Democracia, the Voice of the People, etc. These were and are the groups who act with a proletarian reflex at every critical historical disjuncture of the revolutionary movement (p. 65)"

Then, according to Combat, those groups that acted with a proletarian reflex at every critical historical juncture of the revolutionary movement were the teachers' association and later the breakaway forum, USUAA, the popular papers "Ye Sefiw Meab Demts" etc... - but where is the working class? Not even a

word mentioned about it! This is the level Acher Guzoism has sunk to! It is apparent that when they say the proletariat led the movement, they don't mean the proletariat, but the petty-bourgeoisie, i.e. students, teachers and progressive intellectuals.

But the real intention of those who loudly clamor that the proletariat has led the February movement is to prevent the working class from attaining the hegemony of the democratic revolution. Its essence is to dissuade the proletariat from struggling to obtain the leadership. Five months ago, we wrote in this view as we stated to make the proletariat believe that it has led the movement "to deceive the proletariat on this question is to try to hinder the working class from assuming the leadership of the movement, for it states that this part of the struggle of the proletariat is already accomplished. Is not the petty-bourgeoisie interested in maintaining its leadership and thereby try to disguise itself as a communist? This is a fact told long ago about the petty-bourgeois. Our union has in this respect, a consistent and revolutionary stand. It sees it as its tasks to help the working class assume leadership of the movement by organizing itself and struggling against the petty-bourgeoisie who is now leading." (Teglachin Zena Nr. 1). This still holds good.

The Principal contradiction in Ethiopia is between the broad masses and Feudalism

It is a basic tenet of our movement, that imperialism and feudalism are the two twin enemies of the Ethiopian peoples and that it is the task of the democratic revolution to do away with these. Speaking in strategic terms this is absolutely correct. Nevertheless, it is of paramount tactical importance to specify the relationship of these enemies to the revolutionary struggle at any given period, to distinguish between these and find out which of these two plays the most decisive counter-revolutionary role, so as to isolate and pit against it the greatest possible front.

From this view point, we find that of the two basic contradictions-that between feudalism and the peoples of Ethiopia, and that between imperialism and the peoples of Ethiopia-the former one constitutes the principal contradiction in Ethiopia today. An analysis of the February movement and the demands of the people would clearly show that the main thrust of the struggle was directed against Feudalism. In that we state that the principal contradiction is between feudalism and the broad masses, the Acher Guzoists would like to insinuate that we neglect the struggle against imperialism. On the contrary as we pointed out during the 2nd Federation Congress, the struggle against feudalism is inseparably connected with the struggle against imperialism, that imperialism and feudalism are inter-dependent and in order to destroy one, the other must also be destroyed. Explaining this relationship, we pointed out in the struggle against feudalism and imperialism, there are two erroneous tendencies within the Ethiopian left which have to be combated. - These are. -

a) to consider the principal contradiction to be between imperialism and feudalism on the one hand and the peoples of Ethiopia on the other. This can only divide the people's fire on the two enemies, instead of concentrating on the primary danger at any given period and mobilizing the great possible force against it.

b) to absolutely ^{SEPARATE} the struggle against feudalism and imperialism, to separate these two tasks, wanting first to annihilate one and then begin to fight the other.

Our Acher Guzoists don't agree with this explanation of ours and the thesis that the principal contradiction in Ethiopia today is between feudalism and the broad masses. Instead of trying to counter our position, with scientific arguments, they heap abuse upon ESUE. - most probably because they have nothing else to offer us. We would, however like to remind them, that it is their own publication "Challenge", which 2 years ago wrote in the same spirit as our position, which we quote below, and to which we fully adhere to. In the Challenge entitled, "The national

democratic revolution in Ethiopia", they once wrote:

"In Ethiopia, the principal ^{contradiction} at this stage is the one that exists between feudalism and the broad masses of the people. 'At every revolutionary stage there can be only one principal contradiction.' In Ethiopia now at a time when imperialism carries its rule not by direct occupation or aggression but through the feudal and comprador bourgeois classes, the principal contradiction-of the fundamental contradictions-is the internal one i.e. the contradiction between feudalism and the broad masses of the peoples." (p29)

That was two years ago. Since then not only have they broken with and deny the revolutionary tradition of ESUNA, but struggle with vile and depicable methods against those militants that have remained true to revolutionary theory and are in the van of the Ethiopian Student Movement.

"DIALECTICS is the study of concrete conditions"

The ability to study the concrete conditions in Ethiopia, their various elements and tendencies and the factors that influence the development of events is of crucial importance for the orientation of the revolutionary struggle. Out of the complicity and the contradictoriness of the present Ethiopian society, it is necessary to grasp out those essential and determining moments-whose understanding would give a clearer picture and overview of the present situation. Nevertheless, the process of cognition is rendered difficult, particularly for those of us abroad, due to the row of middle links that complicate the picture and inconsistency of the conditions in Ethiopia. This difficulty does not however release us from the duty of conscientiously analyzing the reality in Ethiopia, for only a correct appraisal of the situation in Ethiopia enables revolutionaries to map out correct tactics for the revolutionary struggle.

It is from this angle, that we oppose the simple declamations and assertions of the ESUNA leadership, particularly in regard to the military government, which have no contact with the reality in Ethiopia. This will show with the following examples :

Example 1.- The ESUNA leadership asserts that the military government is a product of the CIA. We do not know if a renegade

becomes a revolutionary because of such assertions, but one thing we know for sure, is that revolutionaries must proceed from the concrete reality - Otherwise revolutionary theory becomes meaningless. The assertion that the military government is a product of the CIA does not seem to correspond to reality. As a matter of fact there is a certain contradiction between the U.S. imperialists and the provisional military government - that the imperialists went that far as to attempt a coup d'état together with General Amman to overthrow the military government. Rather, as the popular paper "Ye Sefiw Hezb Demts" correctly describes the situation in Ethiopia, there is a certain group of people within and around the provisional military government led by Belatchew Jémaneh, that works in the pay of the CIA to overthrow the military government - that there exists a certain contradiction between the military government and imperialism, to recognize the contradiction between these which must be exploited to advance the revolutionary cause.

Example 2.-

The ESUNA leadership thinks the military is taking the comprador state capitalist road. Here too, we have the ESUNA leadership not knowing what it is talking about, because one of the first economic measures of the military government was to nationalize the economic and financial interest of the international imperialist bourgeoisie in Ethiopia. To talk here, as the ESUNA leadership does, of a comprador character of the military government, is at least temporarily out of place.

A full analysis of the military government and the history of its existence would be beyond the scope of this work. We will restrict ourselves to delineating its main historical features, the factors determining its policy, and its role in present day Ethiopia.

The military council which constituted itself on Sene 21st. was playing a relatively moderate role vis à vis the peoples' movement, but finally was forced to submit to the peoples' demand of deposing the Emperor. With the deposition of the monarch, the military government turned around and tried to repress in a sharper form the strivings of the people for political freedom.

A semi-martial rule was imposed, a state of emergency declared in areas of peasant uprising, and the police broke the demonstration staged by the unemployed. In the meantime, we had a struggle within the military as to the further course of policy - a struggle which became so intense that General Amman tried with the help of the CIA to overthrow the military government. After the execution of the former government officials, the military took a turn for the left (it is a relative term!), put on an increasingly anti-imperialist tone, establishing good relations with the socialist countries, introduced its "socialism" and proceeded with the nationalization of the important financial, industrial, commercial and import-export enterprises. The military government has already in a period of 5 months outlived a number of major crises, but its future would depend on how it handles the land question and the national question - problems for which it is not objectively able to provide thorough-going solutions.

The factors that determine the policy of the provisional military government can be enumerated as follows:-

- 1) the constantly changing situation in Ethiopia which forces the military government to take measures such as the execution of the former officials.
- 2) the influence and presence of progressive elements in Ethiopian society and the struggle of the Ethiopian peoples.
- 3) the struggle between the progressive and reactionary wings within the military council.

It is the interaction of these 3 factors in connection with a multiple of other moments that determine the policy of the military government. The objective limitations of the military council are given by its petty-bourgeois character and its role in the present situation. The military government stands between the people and reaction - it wavers between the two, which explains to a great extent the zig-zag course of its politics. Despite the patriotic nature and progressive character of certain of its officers, the military government as such, in that it hinders the broad masses from getting organized and struggling against their enemies is a roadblock to the revolutionary struggle of the people. On the other hand, the military government stands in contradiction to the feudal class and to a certain extent also to the

imperialists and is thus increasingly forced to seek support from sections of the population, which has up till now been only reluctantly forthcoming.-

In the wake of the February movement, we have a series of new secondary contradictions in the realm of the superstructure that extremely complicate the picture. A clear understanding of the newly arisen secondary contradictions and their utilization is under the present conditions of vital importance for the progress of the revolution. This new series of secondary contradictions are :-

1) Contradiction between imperialism and the military gov't.

The imperialists are extremely displeased with the recent developments Ethiopia, such as the execution of the former officials, the nationalizations, the proclamation of "socialism", establishment of good relations with socialist countries, etc.... After the aborted coup d'état of Gen. Amman, they have considerably reduced their military assistance to Ethiopia and have started a campaign in the international press against the military gov't to pave the way for any future intervention in Ethiopia. The imperialist mass medias such as the BBC, German radio, and the papers Le Monde, Frankfurter Rundschau, Die Welt, Neue Züricher Zeitung, Couriers de la Sera, etc... are full of daily attacks and insinuations against the military gov't. On the other hand, the organs of the military such as the Addis Zemen, are putting on an increasingly sharper anti-imperialist tone. The contradiction between the imperialists is not fundamental, but earmarked - despite of its partially sharp form - by its unsteadiness and inconsistency. The dependence of the military gov't on the imperialists for the supply of arms munition and spare parts for its weaponry limits in the final analysis the extent of this contradiction.

2) The contradiction between the feudal classes and the military gov't

The contradiction between the feudal nobility and the military gov't has to a certain degree assumed an antagonistic character. With the execution of the former officials, the feudalists are busy building up their private armies with the help of imperialist

powers and Arab reactionaries (the former ambassadors who declined to return to Ethiopia act as the couriers) to defend their positions and restore their lost privileges.- If the proposed nationalization of land takes place, it would necessarily tend to destroy the economic basis of the landlords - thereby, most probably provoke a series of landlord uprisings.

3) The contradiction between reactionaries and progressives within the military council

The struggle between the reactionary elements led by Belachew Jemaneh, and the patriotic and progressive elements within the military council is a factor not to be neglected, but one that requires great attention. To push the progressive officers to break away with the reactionary wing and to consistently struggle against it, is a task revolutionaries should not overlook. To overlook this contradiction, and fail to exploit it to weaken the enemy, can at this critical period be only of the greatest service to reaction.

4) The contradiction between arab reaction and the people

The camp of arab reaction, headed by King Feisal, which has done its best to weaken the struggle of the palestinian peoples', and other progressive forces in the Arab world, has turned its attention towards Ethiopia and seeks with all means to liquidate the struggle of the peoples of Ethiopia. It supports the Ali Mirahs, Ras Mengeshas, etc. - those feudal oppressors and tormentors of the Ethiopian people in the effort to extinguish the strivings of the broad masses for revolution. Arab Reaction is the enemy of the peoples' of Eritrea and other oppressed nationalities of Ethiopia, as well as of the oppressed peoples' of the arab world.-

5) The contradiction between the military gov't and the broad masses

Seen in the perspective of the new democratic revolution in Ethiopia, the military government plays an objectively counter-revolutionary role in that it installed its Anti-democratic rules and hindered the peoples' struggle - thus an antagonistic relationship between the military government and the broad masses. This contradiction plays a key role in determining the political picture at this juncture. Of the newly arisen contradictions, the contradiction between the military gov't and the broad masses is the main one. This contradiction can be resolved only

by the organised revolutionary struggle of the people, which will be most probably promoted by the defection of the patriotic and progressive officers of the military council and parts of the army to the side of the people. The resolution of this contradiction creates the condition for the revolutionary solution of the other contradictions.

The above delineated new series of secondary contradictions arose under the conditions of February Ethiopia, on the basis of the intensification of the principal contradiction - that of between feudalism and the broad masses - and in the wake of the sharpening of the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples and the accentuation of the national question.

Let us go back to the ESUNA leadership and see what nonsense they have to offer in this field. According to the ESUNA there would be no contradiction between the imperialists and the military gov't since the latter is a product of the CIA. Moreover, if the military gov't is the product of the CIA there can also be no talk of a struggle between a progressive ^{and} reactionary wing in the military council.

Furthermore, for the ESUNA leadership, the military gov't is bound towards "a solid alliance with the old ruling class" (Combat, p. 24) and as such would mean that it is out of place to talk of a partially antagonistic relationship between the military gov't and feudal nobility - the Ali Mirahs, Ras Mengeshas, etc. ... Instead of a scientific analysis, it is such nonsense and simple declamations that the ESUNA leadership dishes out. - With a really poor account of oneself! The inability to grasp the new situation with its complexity and the series of new secondary contradictions - which is the case of the ESUNA Acher-Guzoists - can only lead to incorrect tactics, failure to exploit these contradictions and be of fatal consequences to the revolutionary struggle.

Is the development of capitalism possible in Ethiopia?

In our first issue of Teglachin Zena, we printed an article sent to us by a member-activist of our union concerning the economic content and basis of the present revolutionary movement. The article sought to throw light upon the fact, that Ethiopia is in a period of transition towards capitalism with the assertion that the process of primitive capital accumulation is taking place. We printed the article with the intent to initiate a discussion on this subject, and to thereby clear away the confusion on this issue - since clarity on the economic content of the present movement is of vital importance, not only to understand the historical significance of the movement, but also to be able to formulate correct tactics and strategies.-

The ESUNA leadership, which during the 2nd Federation Congress together with the USUAA delegates, maintained that capitalism is dying out in Ethiopia, instead of trying to scientifically refute the contention that Ethiopia is taking the capitalist road they hurl vilifications and insults at ESUE. Not bothered by their method of struggle, let us see the bit they have to say to this question.

"If capital is outflowing at a much higher rate than it is coming in the form of foreign investment, if capital gives rise to windfall profits to the imperialists, which they export back to the metropolises, if the products of imperialist induced industries and their cattle is made to die, if our people are mal-nourished, then how on earth would this arrangement lead to primitive accumulation. It is good to quote Karl Marx and Capital, but only if one understands Karl Marx."

Perhaps we haven't understood Karl Marx - but friends, why don't you show us where and how we misunderstood him? Before foaming, at least give yourselves the trouble to explain what Marx said and show where the differences lie. Apparently, from the way the ESUNA leadership argues, not only does it not know what it is talking about, as we'll soon show, but belongs to

those philistines, that are neither willing to learn from others, nor capable of teaching them.

The ESUNA leadership, lines itself in the ranks of the apologetics of capitalism when it asks how on earth, can primitive capital accumulation take place, if people get evicted and become malnourished, their best-pasture lands are taken by the imperialists and their cattle made to die? In other words, primitive capital accumulation can take place only when the peasant is well-nourished, has the best pasture lands and soon. What the ESUNA leadership here maintains, is the talk of a renegade and paid agent of the bourgeoisie.

Contrary to the assertions of the ESUNA renegades, primitive capital accumulation is precisely the process that means the peasants are evicted from their land, that their best lands are taken over by the owners of capital and that the peasants pay dearly for it. As Senayte Bekele correctly put it. -

"...primitive capital accumulation, has always been in history cruel, barbaric and bloody. In Ethiopia, we have it in the form of the ruin of the peasantry, eviction of tenants in thousands and coupled with it the enormous theft of land and the extermination of the indigenous peoples. The present famine, which has forced millions of peasants to abandon their land can only but be a mighty lever of capitalist accumulation." (Teglachin Zena, Nr. 1/74)

Marx in 'Das Kapital' calls primitive capital accumulation as being nothing else than the expropriation of the peasantry, which is in the "annals of humanity engraved with the features of blood and fire." For the ESUNA leadership, however, it is the paradise of the well-nourished peasantry with the best lands!

We are pretty sure, that the ESUNA leadership has no idea of the issue at hand, we'll try to explain the historical and economical meaning of primitive capital accumulation in very simple terms, understandable to any schoolboy. -

The question is where does the capital come from necessary for the rise of the capitalist mode of production in the wombs of feudal society? It can come as much little from the revenues of the feudal lords which is consumed away, as from the accumulated savings of diligent handicraftsmen as vulgar bourgeois economists would make us believe. It is also evident that this "beginning" capital which is the departure point of capitalist production, can't be the result of capitalist production accrued in the form of profit. The capital, which serves as the departure point of capitalist production, comes into being, with the transfer of feudal property in the hands of the bourgeoisie - and this is the real content of the process of primitive capital accumulation. In other words, the rising capitalist class concentrates the wealth of feudal society, mainly land, in its hands. This comes about primarily through the eviction of the peasantry and the expropriation of its land. Moreover, we have also a number of other factors, in history which additionally increase the wealth of the rising capitalist class and are important moments of primitive capital accumulation, such as war spoils, confiscation of church and landlord property, famine, depression of wage levels, increased taxes, etc...

The expropriation of the land of the peasantry, which tears them from their means of subsistence, and hence from the means of production, creates the home market. It means that on the one hand we have a large mass of people, "forcibly torn from their means of subsistence", and are forced to sell their labor power in order to exist, and on the other hand the concentration of wealth - which can be converted into capital - in the hands of a few capitalists.

To reiterate - the question of the primitive accumulation is the question of the "process of devoicing the producer from the means of production". This process is to be considered in two ways:

a) in view of the dissolution of feudal society and the dissolution of the relationship of personal servitude as the prerequisite for the "free" wage-worker and

b) as the process of the constitution and consolidation of the new capitalist relations of production. In his explanations of the process of primitive capitalist accumulation Marx wants to show how 1) a sufficiently large enough mass of wage-workers comes into being and

2) as its anti-pode the capitalist class develops and

3) how accumulation can take place beyond capitalist production and against the limitations of feudal society. In neo-colonial countries like Ethiopia, the effect of imperialism on the accumulation of capital and development of capitalism is of a contradictory character. -

a) On the one hand, imperialism creates the world market, reproduces capitalist relations on a world scale, i.e. introduces capitalist relations into the dependent countries disintegrating the pre-capitalist forms of production.

b) on the other hand, as a system of exploitation, artificially hinders the universal and harmonious economic development of the dependent countries.

It is however in spite of and through the above mentioned contradiction that capitalism develops in countries like Ethiopia. While on the one hand imperialism promotes the rise of capitalist mode of production, on the other hand gives the economic structure a lop-sided and one sided character, intensifies its unevenness and affects the tempo of economic growth. In other words, the development of capitalism, takes place in countries like Ethiopia, under protracted conditions. The main thing however is that in spite of the difficulties, the development of capitalism takes place. The renowned Soviet economic scientists E. Bregel and A. Smirnow, analyzing the effects of imperialism in the third world countries come to the conclusion:

"The capitalist system of world economy presupposes, that the capitalist mode of production dominates in the whole world. In contrast to this, in the epoch of pre-monopol capitalism there existed in the colonial countries no capitalism, although the capitalist countries carried on trade with these. In the stage of imperialism, the export of

capital in the economically poorly developed countries went hand in hand, with the introduction of capitalist production in these countries. As a result of this, the capitalist relations spread out all over the world (what by the way doesn't exclude the fact, that in a few colonies, even under imperialism, precapitalist forms of production still pre-dominate)" (Politische Ökonomie, p. 455)

The single argument of the ESUNA leadership against the development of capitalism in Ethiopia, worth discussing, is the fact that the outflow of money from Ethiopia is greater than the money the imperialists invest in Ethiopia. - Let us see what the errors of this position are. -

Firstly, the development of capitalism is not dependent (although indirectly affected by it) on a favorable balance of payments. These are two different questions, that must not be confused. - What on unfavorable balance of payment affects is the financing of imports and the reserves of hard currency.

Secondly, the investment of the imperialist in Ethiopia is limited to a small number of key enterprises, and the outflow of money in the form of profits, affects only the growth of these industries. It means that beyond the additional capital outlays, the market situation does not allow the imperialists to carry a production on an expanded scale.

Thirdly, as Bukharin correctly pointed out, the exploitation of countries like Ethiopia through imperialism, reduces only the pace of accumulation, but does not make capital accumulation impossible.

Fourthly, although it is generally true that the economic relationship between the metropolitan and third world countries is characterized by an unfavorable balance of payments, just to get things straight, we simply want to mention that in the last 2 years, as a result of the rise of the price of coffee on the world market, Ethiopia enjoys a favorable balance of payments to the amount of a couple of hundred million dollars.

This favorable balance of payment is only of temporary nature and could disappear with the fall of the price of coffee and the rise of the prices of goods, particularly oil, which Ethiopia imports.

But what has the ESUNA leadership to say to this? Absolutely nothing of substance, except abuses, incoherent ideas and a series of contradictory assertions like the following classic gem. For example, the ESUNA leadership says that capitalism is underdeveloping., that capital cannot be "accumulated under the constraints of imperialism", and in the same breath it says that the military is the "new bourgeoisie" taking the state capitalist road. But friends, isn't it clear that under conditions where capital accumulation is impossible, to talk of a new bourgeoisie, much less of state capitalism is absurd?

We have a number of times pointed out the crucial necessity of having clarity on the economic aspect of the February movement. Without a clear understanding of the economic forces at work it is absolutely impossible to appreciate the role and attitudes of the different classes in the revolution, as well as to correctly grasp the character of the present revolutionary movement. This is clearly evident by the ESUNA leadership which almost invariably confuses the democratic and socialist revolutions. It talks constantly of the "proletarian solution", "the all conquering proletarian path", etc. phrases that absolutely mean nothing, and are flung around to cover one's ignorance. For them, what can be the all conquering proletarian path in the bourgeois democratic revolution?

The article entitled "The economic content of the present movement" in Tiglatchen Zena No.1/74 against which the ESUNA leadership polemicized but little understood, seeks to analyze the economic basis of the February movement. It correctly points out that the economic roots of the present revolutionary struggle is the contradiction between the rising capitalist production forces and the feudal mode of production. Moreover, it states that due to the weakness of the national bourgeoisie, it is the petty bourgeoisie that on the superstructural level acts as the vector of capitalist development. In other words, it means that the petty

bourgeoisie is the political representative of capitalism in Ethiopia. However, it shows that since capitalism is discredited in the eyes of the world, certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie can be subjectively anti-capitalists and consider themselves as socialists - although in reality their actions objectively promote capitalist development.

Three months later after this article was written, the military gov't proclaimed its brand of socialism: although in reality its actions rather favor the development of capitalism and have nothing to do with socialism. Let us try to show this. For example, as the "Ye Sefiw Hezb Demts" (No.21) correctly points out, the decree of the military gov't that freezes the prices of staple commodities, hurts the peasantry and promotes at its expense the enrichment of the merchant class. The newly revised regulations which foresee that Ethiopian firms and enterprises have preference in being awarded government contracts favor the interest of the national capitalist class. We also have the same, for instance, with the intended revision of taxation, customs and import-export regulations - measures which will favor capitalist development.

It is the understanding of the capitalist nature of economic basis of the present movement, that would enable us to correctly understand the interests of the different classes in the revolution and how they express these interests. But the ESUNA leadership sees in this an opportunity to attack ESUE "of humpeting the revisionist theory of productive forces?" This too? As the ESUNA leadership itself says, bluffing has also its limits! The demand that one study and understand the economic basis of a revolution which is a requisite of any marxist analysis and the "revisionist theory of productive forces", which asserts among others that socialism is impossible in backward countries are two questions different like day and night. Let this first through your thick skulls!

The Land Question and the ESUNA leadership

The ESUNA leadership, in the van of the revision of the fundamental revolutionary tenets of our movement, dishes the following out and out counter-revolutionary novelty regarding the land question. -

"As regards land reform, what Lenin called the "Prussian Way" or the "American Way" of land reform might be proposed. In either case, the peasant will suffer." (Combat)

So talks only one that has gone over to the side of the peoples' enemies. In effect, what the ESUNA leadership says is whether the agrarian revolution (the american way) takes place or not - whether the peasant receives land or not - it is all the same for the peasant since he suffers in both cases! Only defenders of the old archaic land property relations say such things!

Let us correct what these renegades distorted and give the revolutionary conception of this question.

The development of capitalism in agriculture, which was analyzed by Marx as it took place in England in its classical form, proceeded in other countries in different forms. This was due to the different historical, socio-economical and political circumstances in these countries. Out of a multiple of these forms, Lenin chose 2 characteristic types in view of their socio-economic content - the "prussian" and the "american way". Lenin chose the name "prussian way" because this type of agrarian evolution was particularly characteristic for Prussia - primarily for the areas east of the Elbe. Here, "the feudal landlord economy slowly evolves into the bourgeois landlord economy, which condemns the peasants to decades of most harrowing expropriation and bondage, while at the same time a small minority of "Großbauern" (big peasants) arise". (Lenin, Vol 13, p. 239)

In this economy the landlord and capitalist are one person. The landlords exploit the poverty of the peasants and force them to perform different form of labor services for them.

In a long time, the feudal and capitalist methods of exploitation were inter-twined which to the peasant was particularly tormenting and oppressive. Although they were no longer serfs, the peasants and rural proletarians that worked the land of the landlords were not entirely free - they remained in multifarious forms economically and politically subordinate to the landlord.

On the other hand, in a series of countries, above all in the northern states of America and France, the agrarian development took another form. Since this process occurred most markedly in the USA, Lenin called this path of capitalist agrarian development, 'the american way'. Here 'there is no land lord economy or else it is broken up by revolution which confiscates and splits up the feudal estates...the main background is transformation of the patriarchical peasant with a bourgeois farmer.' (Lenin)

Since feudalism had not developed in America there was feudal property, as the capitalist development of agriculture began. In France, the feudal big property was the result of the French Revolution 1789-97 confiscated and divided up. The landed property of the feudal lords and the church was destroyed and there arose an extensive small peasant property. The path of the revolutionary struggle against the feudal landlords, which is the road of the agrarian revolution and the consistent realization of the slogan 'Land to the tiller' is the 'american way'.

But what does the renegade ESUNA leadership tell us? It tells us that it makes no difference whether the land reform takes the 'prussian' road (the continued servitude of the peasantry) or the 'american road' (the revolutionary destruction of feudalism). In other words, whether the peasantry remains brutally exploited by the landlords or the peasantry carries out an agrarian revolution and confiscates the land of the feudal lords - according to the ESUNA

leadership it is all the same!

The question of land reform and the form it assumes-is not a question to which the peasant ought to be indifferent to as the ESUNA leadership suggests but a question of vital importance to the peasantry and the focus of its attention. This aspect can never be overemphasized. Moreover it is a question upon which the participation of the peasantry in the revolution depends -and thus closely connected with the outcome of the democratic revolution. If the democratic revolution is to succeed and the peasantry to improve its condition, it is absolutely indispensable that the peasantry carry on the agrarian revolution-that the agrarian revolution takes the 'american road'. The 'prussian road' on the other hand means that the revolution has failed and that the agrarian question is being solved in a counter revolutionary way in the interest of the landlord class at the expense of the peasantry. In his critic of the Menshevik agrarian expert Maslow, Lenin points out that victory of revolutionary democracy is causally connected with the victory of the American path and that it is the duty of marxists to do everything in their power to bring about the success of the 'american path'-the path of agrarian revolution.

From the above we see that the ESUNA leadership does not believe in agrarian revolution. Does it at all believe in revolution and armed struggle? This is the question to which we will now turn our attention.

Does ESUNA believe in armed struggle?

ONE of the fundamental tenets of the student movement, that the Ethiopian peoples can destroy their enemies and establish a popular people's government only by means of revolutionary violence seems to no longer have validity for the Acher-Guzoist ESUNA leadership. For our Acher-Guzoists the battle for democracy can

be won and a popular government be established by means of election without the revolutionary armed struggle.

Let us try to show this. We have always maintained that the Acher-Guzoists are contemptful of the mass struggle and are afraid of the turbulence of the masses-that they seek to bring about the Ethiopian revolution without the masses. In pre-february Ethiopia, before the upsurge of the peoples' struggle, the Acher-Guzoists were wild about focoist schemes, trying to convert the student movement into a reservoir for their adventurist schemes. Our union opposed them resolutely, pointing out that the salvation of the Ethiopian people does not lie in the hands of a couple of military heroes. We explained, that as a matter of fact, any military adventure apart from the masses can only hurt the revolution and play into the hands of the enemy. Not only would many potentially useful comrades be lost in hopeless military adventures, but also such adventures would disorganize the revolution in that it confuses the broad masses as to the methods and perspectives of struggle. We stressed that the main task of the day was to integrate with and agitate the masses, rouse them for the revolutionary struggle, and that we should have faith in the masses. We clearly showed that focoism is based on contempt and fear of the masses.

With the upsurge of the February movement and the revolutionary upheavals, it is only natural that the question of armed struggle comes to the forefront. The February movement raised the question of the necessity of armed struggle by the broad masses. Spontaneously, all over the countryside, the peasantry took up arms and started fighting its oppressors.

This is positive and good. Our union which unconditionally opposes focoism and military adventures by a couple of individuals stands for the revolutionary armed struggle of the broad masses. We will put all energy that revolutionary struggles of the broad masses be organized and carried on to a higher level. We will struggle to help the peasant uprising get an organized character and carry into these uprisings the element of political consciousness and thereby lend it a conscious perspective. We will untiringly and energetically promote the political fermentation of the people and strive to give to every spontaneous form of protest a consciously revolutionary character.

But what ^{do} the ESUNA leadership do? These renegades, who, contemptful of the masses a couple of years ago were peddling their focoism now try to scare us with the spectre of civil war! At a time when the masses are making use of revolutionary methods in the struggle for democracy, the Acher-Guzoists discover the electoral process as the path towards a popular gov't. For armed struggle, they have no sympathy leftover. See what these renegades have to say:-

" The Executive Committee (of ESUE) is on the other hand ridiculing the democratic principle of elections because of their inapplicability at a 'revolutionary period.' ...Are democratic elections automatically outmoded because of the existence of the 'revolutionary period'? What form of struggle works? What do they call for? For armed struggle?

Just imagine! They put in such a way that the idea of an armed struggle is unthinkable and that it does not come in question at all! Yes! Renegades, keep on peddling your elections in a country

where the precondition for democracy-the defeat of feudalism and imperialism-as such does not exist. Yes Acher-Guzoists, peddle your parliamentary form of struggle while the masses are engaged in illegal and un-parliamentary forms of struggle! We will see how far you get.

On the theoretical plain, it is correct that revolutionaries must be organized and have the support of the masses before initiating the armed struggle. The reality in Ethiopia is however, that in different areas, the peasants and oppressed nationalities are engaged in armed revolutionary violence against their oppressors. The question is what ought revolutionaries do under this circumstances? We believe the answer is clear. While giving absolute priority to the task of political organization of the broad masses, it is also (and also to be considered as part of the task of organizing) absolutely necessary to give the armed uprisings a conscious and political character and intensify these. We cannot remain passive to the revolutionary struggles of the broad masses- we will give it every support, we will do all our best to deepen and consolidate it. Here the attitude of Marx towards the Paris Commune is instructive. Although Marx considered it a madness to stage an insurrection in Paris and advised his political friends against it, he nevertheless gave it every possible support once it began. We believe that is the only possible attitude of a revolutionary.

In Ethiopia, due to the spontaneous character of the movement and the uneven level of consciousness, we have different forms of struggles being carried on at different levels. The methods of struggle range from armed conflicts to the most harmless mode of

civil resistance. In the organization of the revolutionary struggle of the people, it is necessary to judiciously combine these different forms of struggle - to combine them into the different facets of an organized whole.

Is the ESUNA leadership reformist?

From the above we have seen how the ESUNA Acher-Guzoists who never really believed in mass struggles take refuge in harmless slogans as the broad masses entered the arena of struggle. Let us see what reason they give to explain their counter-revolutionary attitude towards the mass struggle.-

"What constitutes revolutionary tactics? Reform tactics? Are they (revolutionaries) opposed to all reforms or compromises? To the reformist reformism is his principal objective. To the revolutionary it is only one possible route to achieve a well-defined objective. Reformist activity is a by-product of revolutionary class struggle. The converse is not true." Combat p.83.

Firstly, we would like to mention that the Acher-Guzoists have no idea of the distinction between reform and reformism and the dialectical relationship between reform and revolution. To get things straight according to Marxist theory, reforms are concessions won by the people in the course of their revolutionary struggle. As such, revolutionaries are not opposed to exploiting reforms to further the revolutionary struggle. A reformist however renounces to utilize reforms for the revolutionary struggle, but merely sees in them, means to gradually transform society. In other words, reformism is the belief that the ends of the revolution can be achieved by means of gradual reforms.

And what do the Acher-Guzoists say? Let us look at the above quotation again. They say reformism is to the revolutionary "one possible route to achieve a well defined objective." This can only mean that it is possible through reforms to attain the well-defined objectives (?) of the revolution.

No wonder the Acher-Guzoists go peddling their 'caretaker Gov't', "the parliamentary form of struggle", etc., etc. around. It is not at all surprising that the people who believe that the well-defined objectives of the revolutionaries can be achieved via reforms, reach such conclusions. For Acher-Guzoism, the journey along the path of revolution ^{is} very, very short indeed!

What is the meaning of Combat?

One may say that the latest issue of Combat is the certificate of the political bankruptcy of the ESUNA leadership. Not only is it unable to pose the questions at hand correctly, let alone answer them, but absolutely incoherent and shows that the ESUNA leadership has reached the stage where it does not know what it is talking about.

Nevertheless, it is of prime importance to understand the true significance of Combat, the intent it was supposed to serve and draw lessons from it as to how the ESUNA leadership fights the revolutionary wing of the Ethiopian student movement. In this regard Combat has the following aspects:-

- 1) It clearly shows that the ESUNA leadership lags behind the development of the Ethiopian Student Movement and as such represents the frantic attempt to drag down the advanced elements of the movement to its own backward level.

- 2) In view of the fact, the ESUNA leadership is very unpopular at home, losing its foothold in Europe and beset with growing criticism and opposition by militants within ESUNA itself, the latest issue represents a desperate attempt to make the best out of the situation and reverse this trend.
- 3) Unable to hold its own on the field of theory, the ESUNA leadership has sunk to the level of deception, falsification and slander as its mode of arguments. By the way this characteristic is not the monopoly of the ESUNA leadership but is also the trait (differentia specifica) of its like in Europe and the Middle East. In the realm of personal character assassination and all that belongs to this profession, it is the friends in Algeria that excel and outshine all others. Something which the ESUNA leadership surely envies and imitates. These slanders and abuses which are hurled at the revolutionary wing of the Ethiopian Student Movement are for us as Lenin would remark, "the argument of the weak" -

A P P E N D I X

Part notes on the Bulletin.

Although the Federation has booted out its former editor and replaced him with an enlarged editorial board, the better has not changed for the better. It is apparent that the problem was not that of replacing editors, but lay in the bankruptcy of the political line itself. This will be clear, as we see how the first issue of the Bulletin this year deals with questions of the present movement.

The Bulletin which believes that the burning question of the movement is the installation of a popular provisional government, tries to reason it out as follows:-

"At this crucial stage of the struggle the triumph of revolutionary democracy or conservative reaction depends on the incontrovertible fact whether this popular will finds concrete expression in the creation of this democratic organ of power or in its trampling under the iron boots of forceful military domination our political life... In our eyes, the decisive battle between revolution and counter-revolution both within the Armed Forces and in the political life of the country at large will be decided by urgent political questions whether the popular will triumphs in the constitutions of a provisional democratic government or in its defeat to be replaced by valid cry of 'law and order'.

So, so. The decisive battle between counter-revolution and revolution will be decided by whether a popular caretaker government will be constituted or not! The constitution of a popular

caretaker government is supposed to signify a decisive victory over counter-revolution. It is such perfidy and nonsense our Acher-Guzoists would like to make us believe.

Contrary to the assertions of the Acher-Guzoists, as all questions of democracy, the victory of revolution over counter-revolution will and can only be decided by the revolutionary armed force of the people. It is the successful armed struggle of the people that constitutes a decisive victory of revolution over counter-revolution, i.e. feudalism and imperialism.

Here we have two differing conceptions of what constitutes the decisive elements in the victory of revolution over counter-revolution. In the Acher-Guzoists, it is the mere constitution of a caretaker government, while we believe that it is only the successful armed struggle of the people that amounts to a decisive victory over feudalism and imperialism. As a matter of fact, without the successful armed revolutionary uprising as a pre-condition, the constitution of a popular caretaker government is not only a farce but signifies that the revolution has been aborted. The provisional popular gov't of the Acher-Guzoists, could only then be a spawn of counter-revolution - a supporting column of feudalism and imperialism. It could not be otherwise, even if it wanted to.

Furthermore the Acher-Guzoists talk of the provisional popular gov't as a necessity for the transition of power from autocracy to the people as in the following:

"The historical importance of this provisional democratic gov't at the present is dictated politically by the urgent need of the revolutionary process in the brief period of transition of power from that of autocratic rule to a popularly elected government of the people." Bulletin p.1

But what constitute the material conditions for the transition of power and how does it come about? One would vainly expect an answer from the Acher-Guzoists. In our opinion, political power comes out of the barrel of a gun - all other ways are both illusive and reactionary. The condition for the transition of power can only be the revolutionary overthrow of feudalism and imperialism. The Acher-Guzoists want to hide this truth, keep silent about it and beat around the bush when it comes to talking about the material conditions of the transition of power to the people. Lenin had often explained that the essence of opportunism exists in the fact that it hushes up the necessary conditions for the capture of state-power. How true are his words! In any case it remains the greatest riddle of all times how a peoples' gov't can come into being and democratic elections be held, without the revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary forces that determine the destiny of the people of Ethiopia.

Out of the other errors in this Bulletin, we just like to concentrate on the land question, which is of crucial significance and see how with which incredible light-mindedness our Acher-Guzoists deal with this question.

"3. Until a popularly elected democratic gov't of the people work out a basic policy on the agrarian question, and implement the revolutionary demand 'Land to the tiller', the provisional democratic government should enact a decree to the effect of nationalizing all lands, and declare officially the abolition of rent, services and other feudal dues and obligations."

Here then are at least four gross errors which we shall deal with:-

1) If the land is to be first nationalized -becomes property of the state -then to suggest that the popular gov't work out a policy 'to implement the revolutionary demand'land to the tiller',that means to divide land among the peasants, shows only how much it is confused about the land question. For in comparison to the nationalization,the division of land is of a regressive nature.

2) When one talks of the revolutionary implementation of the slogan 'land to the tiller';it means the carrying out of an agrarian revolution.However the way the Bulletin puts it, it seems to be understood as a mere administrative measure.

The demand for the nationalization of land,as the Bolsheviks never tired from explaining,must be bound with the destruction of the corrupt bureaucratic state machinery. For can we call for the land to be in the hands of the state and be indifferent to the fact that this would strengthen the state and that the lives of millions of peasants would depend on the corrupt state bureaucrats? Not for the Acher-Guzoists but for the revolutionary left of the Ethiopian Student Movement,the demand for the nationalization of land is inseparably bound with the destruction of the feudal state apparatus,-and its replacement by the state organs of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry!

We see in the above,that the Acher.Guzoists have no clarity about the fundamental and crucial questions of the present revolutionary period - not only are they confused,but they seek to confuse others too.

3) The demand that rent be abolished is ridiculous -Rent can just disappear with the abolition of capitalism -when ownership

becomes social.To simply clamour for the abolition of rent.in a bourgeois democratic revolution is nothing but absurdity- anarchist demagogy.Nationalization,which is a pure bourgeois measure,does not do away with rent per se -but only with one form of rent - absolute rent -which has its roots in the private ownership of land.

The nationalization of land which does away with the private ownership of land -has nothing socialistic about it - creates conditions for the freest movement of capital in agriculture. Of the two kinds of ground rent - absolute rent and differential rent - it is absolute rent which can be done away with within the framework of the bourgeois democratic revolution.But differential rent can first disappear with the abolition of capitalism.

These are simple economic facts our Acher-Guzoists have no idea of !

Tamirat Zerihun

በሰባት ዓመት አንድ ጽሁፍ ያወጣና በተጻፈ ገጽና ትውፍት በገንባር ቀደምትነት ታገለገለ ይህን ያንን እርገናሉ የሚለውን ያለጄያ ማህበርና እርሱም ፈጠሮ የሚለውን የብሉን አፍሪካና የከባላናው ያህል ያካባቢ ማህበር ጽሁፍ አገልግሎት፡-

"With the possible difference of approach, we find that the position of the regime's paid journalists and that of the ESUE leaders are the same. No doubt they will say that there is a basic difference between them, no doubt the ESUE leaders will say that they are sincere, revolutionary... But we can't fly to Paris and elsewhere to X-ray your true intentions. The problem is more than financial... (Algeria, p. 10)

እንገላህ፣ ያውርጋ ማህበር ከአለፈው ያያች ጋር በሚለይባት የፖለቲካ ጥያቄያች ፖሊቲካ ወለሰ ሲሆን የይገባ፡፡ ሌላው ቢቀር፡፡ አፍሪካ ነታችንን በበጎ የፖለቲካ ክርክር እንደሚባል የውርጋ ማህበር የሚለው ሌላ ነው ፍላጎት ሌላ ነው፡፡ ይህንን ሀሳብን በራሷ ለማየት ባይቻልም ረቢላኝና ዊ ነን ሲፈቱሁ አተው፤ ጥሙ ይባላል ፍለ፡፡ ገረም ክርክር፣ ያውርጋ ማህበር ቀደም የሚጠበቅ፡፡

የአለፈው ያያች በሚለው አፍሪካ ማህበር በበኩሉ በላቲን አፍሪካ ተጻፈ ገጽና ትውፍት በሀገራችን ላይኛና በደሃ ላይኛ መካከል በአገር ቤትና በውጭም ሰፊ ተገልጿል እንደተገኘው የደሃ ላይኛ አገር ቤት ይልቅ ከመቶ በኋላ በውጭም አገር በሰሜን አፍሪካ ይልቅ እንደተገኘው የውርጋ ግን አሰባራችን ስላለ ተገባላቸው የውርጋ ማህበር "has remained to date the stronghold of young aristocrats, a breeding ground of notorious debtors..." ይላል፡፡ የፈረንሳይ ብሉን አፍሪካ አገራ ፈረንሳይን የሚያውቀው የአገሪቱና የአገሪቱ ላይኛና በላህት ነው የሚል ሕዝብ ተገልጿል እንደሚባሉ ደብዳቤያችን አሰራጭታ፡፡ በተጻፈ ገጽና ትውፍት እንገላህ ዓይነት የሕዝብ ተገልጿል ወይም የተጻፈ ገጽና ትውፍት የተገለጸ ታሪክ በሀገራችን ላይኛና በደሃ ላይኛ መሀል የተገኘው እንደሆነ ከነሱ መስማታችን ነው፡፡ እስካሁን እንደምናውቀው ተራራ የተጻፈው የሚገናኙት በፖለቲካ እምነታችን በአገራችን እንደሚገኝ ጋብቻ በአገሪቱ የጠራ አይመስለንም ነበር፡፡ ገንገባር ቀደም ሲሆን... ለነገሩ ገንገቢ የፈረንሳይ ያውርጋ ማህበር አንድ አሰራር ተገልጿል ይባላል ወዲያው ይገባ የደርግ ደጋፊ! ባንድ ጊዜ የሠለጠነ የሚተራረዱ መደቦች ጥቅም ይገባ!! አንድ ከበርሊን የወጣ የነሱ ሰያፍ ጽሁፍ "ቢተባባሪነት ከተገደለው በኋላ ያውርጋ መሪያ ደርግን ወይም ደምረዋል" ይላል፡፡ ይህናው ይሻሻል፡፡ ቢያንስ የአሰራር ተገልጿል ሆኖ የገደብ ከበር ተደጋፊ ሌላን እንደሚያገለግል ገብተዋል!!

ሌላው የተገለጸ ዘዴ ይገባ ማህበራችን ያላለውን አለ በማለት ያለውን በመጠቀም የዘመናዊነት የሚፈልጉትን ያውርጋ ማህበር በሰላ/አዲስ ፊውላሊዝምና እምፔሪያሊዝም/ ለሰላው አገባቢ ለማቅረብ የሚከፈልን ነው፡፡ ብዙ ያሳሉያችን አጠቃላይ ይህንን ነጥብ ለማሳየት ይቻላል፡፡ ገን ተራራ ሌት ያሳያችን ሁሉ የነሱንም የኛንም ጽሁፍ ወስደው እያሰተገቡ ቢያንዳንዳቸው በጽሁፍ ገጽ ውስጥ አቋቋማችን መመዝገባችን ብቻ ባይሆን ለምን እንደሚመዘዙ ጥያቄ በቀላሉ ሊረቱ ይቻላሉ ብሉን በሰላና ገንገቢነት ያሳሉያችን አገወሰ ፍለገ፡፡

የብሉን አፍሪካ የወጣው ጽሁፍ ለዚህ ነጥብ ከላይ አስከፊና ጥሩ ያሳሉ ነው፡፡ ለምሳሌ በገጽ 14 ላይ ታይቶ "ያስታወቀው" ነው ብሉ እንደሚሉ ተለው ይጻፋል፡፡

"They added that other classes needed for the rebellion, the working class and petty-bourgeois are non-existent
"To the peasant they have the highest contempt as they declared it in Tigrachin no. 3, 1975"

ከላይ በጠቀስና ጥሙ ጽሁፍ ውስጥ ሁሉ ተደጋግሞ የሚመጣ አንድ ውሳኔ አለ፡፡ "ያውርጋ ማህበር አዲሱን ሚክራስ ረቢላኝን የሚመራው መሪያ ያለበት የገደብ ክርክር ወደብ ነው ይላል" እየተባለ በጽሁፍ ጥሙ ተጠቅሟል፡፡ ከማህበራችን ጽሁፍ አንዱን እንደገና ያነበበ እንደሚያስተውለው ሁሉ የማህበራችን መጽሐፍ ከወዘለደረ በስተቀር ሌላ መደብ ይህን ረቢላኝን መርቶ ከፍላጎት ለማድረስ እንደሚቻል ብዙ ጊዜ ጻፈዋል፡፡ ታዲያ ለምን ይሻሻል? ተከታይ አቋቋማችን መተቸት ያታውላል ያን ማድረግ ይቻላል?? የየካቲትን እንቅስቃሴ የመራው ገደብ ክርክር ወደብ ነው ማለትና አዲሱን ሚክራስ ረቢላኝን የሚመራው ገደብ ክርክር ወደብ መሆን አለበት ማለት በማይና መረትን ያህል የተራራ ቀናቸው፡፡

በታዲያ "በላቲን አፍሪካ ያለው ዋና የሀብት ተጠባቢ ተቃርኖ በጥናቱ በገጽ ተፈጥሮ - በባላባታው - መደቦች መካከል ነው ቢሆንም ፊውላሊዝም በከበር ትውፍት ከወዘለደረ፣ በገደብ በሀብት በሀረብ የመካከለኛ ያሉት ቀሪ ነገሮች ኮዚህ ከጥናቱ ቀሪ ጋር በጥበቅ የተሰበረ፣ ሊነጣጠሉ የማይችሉ ናቸው፡፡" ተብሎ ተጽፎ ነበር፡፡ በተጨማሪም በላቲን አፍሪካ ሀብት ተጠባቢ የመመሪያ ወረራ ቀሪ ነው በፊውላሊዝም በርዕድና በሰላው ሕዝብ መካከል ያለው ነው፡፡ ይህም የላቲን አፍሪካ ሀብቶች ባንድ በኩል ፊውላሊዝምና እምፔሪያሊዝም በሌላ በኩል መካከል ያለውን ቀሪ መካከል አይደለም ተብሎ ተጻፈ፣ ተነገረ፡፡ በነዚህ የመጨረሻ ነጥቦች ላይ እዚህ መጽሐፍ ውስጥ ሌላ ጽሁፍ ይመለከታል፡፡ ገን የተነሳው ጥያቄ ያን እንደሆነ ያሳገባው የሁሉ መሪያ ጥሙ በፊውላሊዝምና በእምፔሪያሊዝም መካከል የታደረ ገንብ

በረቱ/ከሞባት ገጽ 41/ ይገኛል፡፡ የሰሜን አፍሪካው ጸሐፊ ደገፍ
 "The main and only contradiction whose solution could relieve the
 problems of the society is the contradiction between the peasant
 and land lord." (p.15) *Emphasis ours.*

Tateq the mouth piece of the ESUE leaders declared that the February
 Revolutionary upsurge is a result of the basic contradiction
 between the peasant and the land lord alone, no more no less than
 a mere peasant disturbance." (p.15 *emphasis ours*)

እንዲሁ የተባለውን ተጠቅ ያነበብኩለሁ ከዚህ ቀደም ተነሱት ያየ ሰውርጅ
 ማህበር ላይ የሰነዘሩት ክሬክ በረ ወለደ እንደሆነ ማረጋገጥ ይቻላል፡፡ እንዲሁ
 ከተጠሰን እናገባዋል፡፡ በሌላውም አንድ የመፈረሻ ምሳሌ ሰጥተን ይህን ነጥብ እን
 ዘጋለጥ፡፡

የ14ኛው ጥቅም/የአውሮፓ ማህበር/ ራፖር ላይ የሚከተለው ተጽፏል፡፡

እዚህ ላይ ለመዘርዘር የምንፈልገው በሊት ዌልያ ውስጥ በነበረው አያቸዋል ባለ
የሚሄደውን የገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት፡፡ ይህ ክፍል አሁን ካለበት ሁኔታ
 የተነሳ ረብሶቹና ይህ ይጨምራል፡፡ የሠራተኛውን ርእሰ ተሳታፊ የሚቀበል
 አለበት፡፡ ይህ ገን እንደተገሉ ደረጃ የሚለይ ነው፡፡ ባሁኑ ጊዜ በሊት ዌልያ
 እነሱ ተራ የፖለቲካ ጉዳት አለ፡፡ ከበፊት ከፍ ቢለም ሆኖም የሆነ ለረብሶቹን
 የተሟላ ሁኔታ አለ እንደሆነ፡፡ በበደክቷት ከጉዳት ሙሉ በሙሉ ተሟልቷል እን
 ለም፡፡ ከዚህም ውስጥ ፒቲ ስርዓቱ ከሌላው ጋር ቢገናኝ ፖለቲካ ጉዳት ከፍ
 ቢለም በደክቷት አላገኘም፡፡ በዚህ የተነሳ ፒቲ ስርዓቱ ፍር ራሳቸውን
 እየሆነ ሊሄድ ይቻላል፡፡ ባሁኑ ጊዜ የፒቲ ስርዓቱ ጥያቄ ነገላት የሚደረግ
 በት ደረጃ አልደረሰም፡፡/ የአውሮፓ14ኛ ጠ/ጥቅም ራፖር፡፡ ገጽ 17 ሥርዓት ዋና/

ይህንን ፓራገፍ ከሞባት እንደፈለገው ከተረጎመ በኋላ/ከሞባት ገጽ 39
 ላይ የተሰጠውን ተርጉም ይህን ከዚህ በላይ የተነሱትን አገባቢ ያስተያይ/ እንደሚከ
 ተለው ማለት ነው ይላል፡፡

"This thesis advances the following absurd notions. The military
 Junta is a member of the petty-bourgeois class. 'It can contin-
 ue to be radicalized'. Because of this, it shall raise the consc-
 iousness of the masses. Its role of radicalizing others and itself
 cannot be neglected. Therefore the stage of its leadership is
 still not exhausted. Therefore, they must put their thrust in the
 junta rather than their own independence and initiative." (p.40)

ራፖር ውሳኔውን ጥያቄ ሳናሰናድፈን የሚለውንና የከሞባት አዘጋጅ ማለት ነው
 የሚሉትን እናጠቃለላለን፡፡

የክሬክ ተባብሮ በሚያደርግበት አካባቢ ገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት የተገለጸ
 ደርሻና ጥያቄ አለው፡፡ ከበዙ አገር ተገለጸ ታስቦኩነቱን ከነጥል ጸሐፊ ለማየት ይቻ
 ላል፡፡ ለምሳሌ ሌኒን የደም ሲሰራ ለሰራተኛው/ የራሱን ገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት ከገፍ/ ያወ
 ባውን እያስታወሰ እንደሚከተለው ይጻፋል፡፡

"Lastly, I should draw to thereaders' attention, the concluding
 pages of this article, which emphasize the positive (from the
 Marxist standpoint) features and aspects of Narodism as a revo-
 lutionary -democratic trend in a country that was on the thresh-
 old of bourgeois revolution. This was a theoretical formulation
 of the propositions which twelve of thirteen years later found
 their practical and political expression in the 'left bloc' ele-
 ctions to the second Duma and in the 'left bloc' tactics." (Lenin,
 Coll. Works; Vol. 13, p. 99)

እንደዚሁም ሌኒን በሰላይኛው ሱን ያተ ሲን የሚለው (C.W. Vol. 18, p. 163-
 169) ማየት ይጠቅማል፡፡ ባጥሩ ራፖር እነሆኑ እንደረገጡ ሁሉ በሌሁኑ የሊት ዌልያ ሁኔታ
 የክሬክ ተባብሮ በደም ሲሰራ ገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት ረብሶቹና ለገላለጹ ለሚሰጥ
 ዋስታል፡፡ የከሞባት አዘጋጅ ሆኖቹ ቢሆኑ በሊት ዌልያ ገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት ጥያቄ
 እያሉ መከራከር ይገባቸው ነበር፡፡ ያለመታገዝ ፕሮዘዝ ውስጥ ገጠፍ * የሊት ዌልያ ሕዝብ
 ተገላጭ ለራገፍ ይተውጥላል ይላቸ ደርገ ይልቅ አለቸሁ* ይላናል፡፡

ከሌዘና መሪዎችና ከመሰሉትም ጋር በጥቅም ለመከራከር የሚያስገባው ሌላው
 ነገር ደገፍ ላለበት ጥያቄ መሰጠት ይጠቅማል የተነሳውን ጥያቄ ይሸገሉ፡፡ ለምሳሌ፡፡ በሊት
 ዌልያ ሠራተኛውን አንድነት ማህበር/ሲባላ/ ላይ በኖረው ሰላማዊ መሪዎች መካከል ሰላም
 ያውርጥ ማህበር ሲባላ በፍጥረት ሆኖ በተለይ አሁን ባለው ወዘተ/ መሪዎች በመገንባት የተ
 ሸሙ እንደ ሌላው ቢታዩ በሚከራከሉት መንገድ በወዘተ ይረዳ በራሱ የተመረጠ አይደለም፡፡/
 የሊት ዌልያን ወዘደር መደብ ታሪካዊ የፖለቲካ ጥቅም ሊጠበቅ የሚችል ድርጅት አይደለም
 በሚለው የሲባላው ውሳኔ ይታያል መገለጫዎችና አቋማት ከገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት ወዘተ. ላይ ተ
 አያያውሙ፡፡ ለምሳሌ ሲባላው * ጊዜያዊ ህዝባዊ መንግስት * የሚል ውሳኔ ቢያሰጥ የሊት ዌ
 ላይ ወዘደር ሞያ ድርጅት የሚረዳ ገዢ ክርክር ተከታይነት አቀረቡት ይላል እንደ ይህን
 ውሳኔ እንደወዘደረ መደብ አቋማት/የወዘተ ይረዳ የፖለቲካና የታሪክ ጥቅም ሊጠበቅ ከሕግ
 ድርጅት -ከሕግ ህገ ታሪክ - የሚመጣ ውሳኔ በገን ነው የዚህ መደብ አቋማት ሊዘዝ የሚችለው/
 አይተባለውም፡፡ የሌዘና መሪዎች የሊት ዌልያ ወዘደር ጊዜያዊ መንግስት መተባበሩ/ በሲባላው
 ውሳኔ ላይ በመመርኮስ/ ቢያደነግሩን የይተባለ፡፡ እንገዲህ የተነሳው መንግስት ሥልጣን
 ጥያቄ ስለሆነ የሲባላው አቋማት የሊት ዌልያ ወዘደር መደብ አቋማት የሚሰጡትን ፈላጊ

[illegible]

"Support for the peoples choice is imperative if a civil war isto be averted in Ethiopia. Otherwise a civil war is imminent in Ethio- pia and the WWFES solomonely declares that the responsibility lies entirely on the shoulders of the U.S.imperialists and their paid agents in Ethiopia." (Statement of WWFES, in Combat, app. I, p. 5)

በጥረጥረ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ በሚያስፈልገበት ጊዜ ሲቪል ጦርነት ሊነሳባቸው ይችላል፡፡ የአሰራሪያችን ደገፍ በሌላው ጥያቄ በጥቅምት እንዲህ ይላሉ:-

"In its reactionary opposition to the democratic demands of the people(Popular Provisional government,G.AI) the ESUE leadership had made a somersault(impossible for anyone but refined petty- bourgeois athletes of opportunism)to appear as the fiery champions of people's war. How do Asrat Girma,Negat Amde and other ፀረመሳጽ fellows feel now?" (Algeria,p.8)

እያንዳንዱ ጊዜ የሲቪል ጦርነት 'ላሚያስ ጥር' ጊዜያዊ ሕገመንግሥት ባይሆን የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ለሲቪል ጦርነት ለሚያዘጋጅ ድርጅት እንዲታገዱ ይላሉ፡፡ እርግጥ ደገፍ ያነጥባል 'የራሳችን' የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ከጥፋት ነፃ ለማግኘት ሊያስችላቸው የሚችል ተገባሪ ስራዎች፡፡ አሁንም አይከለከሉም፡፡ የጥቂት 'ገራ የደገፍ' ፀርፀር እንዲሁ ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት አይደለም፡፡ ነገር ገን ማህበራዊ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ፈቃድ ነፃ ለማግኘት የሚያደርጉትን ፀደቃ ሊያደርጉ የሚገባቸውን የጦር ተገባሪ መደቦች ብቻ ባይሆን በፈቃድ የሚታዩ ስራዎች፡፡ በተለይም ዛሬኛውን ሕዝብ ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ የሕግ ማህበር ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡ ለአሰራሪያችን መልስ፡፡ ለሚገባቸው ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት በደግሞ አስፈላጊነት ገርግ ደስ ይላቸዋል፡፡

ረቢዎችና ሌሎች ባለበት ጊዜ የጥፋት ረቢዎችና ሌሎች ማህበራዊ እንደሚገባቸው የሌላን ጥፋት የሌላው መፍትሄን እንዲያገኙ ይላሉ፡፡ በዚህ ጥያቄ ላይ በጊዜያዊ ሕገመንግሥት ባለው በጋራ አገልግሎት፡፡ ፀደቃ የተለፈው አርሰበት ባሕርና ገን እንዲሁ የሌላው መፍትሄ ፀብተን እናስተካከል፡፡ ለረቢዎችና ሌሎች ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት 'ጥላታ ለውጥ' ለማሳካት እንዲህ ይላሉ፡፡

"The Bolsheviks,for example,took part in parliament both at the hight of their seizure of power and after 1917"(p.84)

ለውነት ገን አስፈላጊ ሥልጣን ለመያዝ የተያረሱ ጊዜ ፓርላማ ፅብተን ለሌላው ስራ ፀብተን እንዲያገኙ የተረፈውን የባለቤትነት ፓርላማ ለባለቤትነት ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡

ፀብተው ነበር፡፡ ሥልጣን በጋራ ማህበራዊ እንዲሁ የሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡ የፀደቃውን ሕገመንግሥት ከጥፋት ነፃ ለማግኘት ሊያስችላቸው የሚችል ተገባሪ ስራዎች፡፡ አሁንም አይከለከሉም፡፡ የጥቂት 'ገራ የደገፍ' ፀርፀር እንዲሁ ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት አይደለም፡፡ ነገር ገን ማህበራዊ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ፈቃድ ነፃ ለማግኘት የሚያደርጉትን ፀደቃ ሊያደርጉ የሚገባቸውን የጦር ተገባሪ መደቦች ብቻ ባይሆን በፈቃድ የሚታዩ ስራዎች፡፡ በተለይም ዛሬኛውን ሕዝብ ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ የሕግ ማህበር ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡

2. በሰላም ይገኛል

በሊት ዩኤስ የሚኖሩት ጥያቄ የረቢዎችና ሌሎች ማህበራዊ እንደሚገባቸው የሚችል ተገባሪ ስራዎች፡፡ አሁንም አይከለከሉም፡፡ የጥቂት 'ገራ የደገፍ' ፀርፀር እንዲሁ ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት አይደለም፡፡ ነገር ገን ማህበራዊ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ፈቃድ ነፃ ለማግኘት የሚያደርጉትን ፀደቃ ሊያደርጉ የሚገባቸውን የጦር ተገባሪ መደቦች ብቻ ባይሆን በፈቃድ የሚታዩ ስራዎች፡፡ በተለይም ዛሬኛውን ሕዝብ ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ የሕግ ማህበር ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡

"Thus to say that the February upsurge established the necessity for the organizations of the labouring masses is to completely betray a failure to understand the significance of the upsurge, to belittle it and to stand aloof from continuing the struggle. The necessity to form organizations, the necessity to make revolution is an established fact before, during and even after February," (p. 76)

ፀብተው ነበር፡፡ ሥልጣን በጋራ ማህበራዊ እንዲሁ የሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡ የፀደቃውን ሕገመንግሥት ከጥፋት ነፃ ለማግኘት ሊያስችላቸው የሚችል ተገባሪ ስራዎች፡፡ አሁንም አይከለከሉም፡፡ የጥቂት 'ገራ የደገፍ' ፀርፀር እንዲሁ ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት አይደለም፡፡ ነገር ገን ማህበራዊ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ፈቃድ ነፃ ለማግኘት የሚያደርጉትን ፀደቃ ሊያደርጉ የሚገባቸውን የጦር ተገባሪ መደቦች ብቻ ባይሆን በፈቃድ የሚታዩ ስራዎች፡፡ በተለይም ዛሬኛውን ሕዝብ ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ የሕግ ማህበር ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡

የድርጅቱን አሰራርና የጥፋት ሕገመንግሥት የሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡ የፀደቃውን ሕገመንግሥት ከጥፋት ነፃ ለማግኘት ሊያስችላቸው የሚችል ተገባሪ ስራዎች፡፡ አሁንም አይከለከሉም፡፡ የጥቂት 'ገራ የደገፍ' ፀርፀር እንዲሁ ሕዝባዊ ጦርነት አይደለም፡፡ ነገር ገን ማህበራዊ የሊት ዩኤስ ሕዝቦች ፈቃድ ነፃ ለማግኘት የሚያደርጉትን ፀደቃ ሊያደርጉ የሚገባቸውን የጦር ተገባሪ መደቦች ብቻ ባይሆን በፈቃድ የሚታዩ ስራዎች፡፡ በተለይም ዛሬኛውን ሕዝብ ለሚገባቸው ለሕዝባዊ የሕግ ማህበር ለሕዝባዊ ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ለሲቪል ጦርነት እንዲዘጋጅ ሕዝቡን እንዲጠቅሙ ማለት ነው፡፡

ከመጀመሪያው አገሩ ገር ገልጽ መሆን አለበት፡፡ በኖና በአዘና ሙሉ ናረው ጠባቢ የተኖሩት መደብ አናደራጅ በግላው ላይ ለሆነ አይቸለ፡፡ የተኖሩት መደቦች አገላለጽን አገጠቀብ በግላው ላይ ነው፡፡ ፌዴራል ፊደራል ያለውን ገጽ በቦርታ በተጣሪ ጥህበት ፅንፈኛ ጥያቄዎች ይገኛሉ፡፡ አለበለዚያ ገን ሆላገሩ ሆኖ ላባለደር ነገ በሉ መደረግ ይቻላል አገሪቱ በዚህ ሆኖ የሊተዳደር ወዘደር ጥያቄዎች አይቻሉም፡፡ እኛ አገሪቱን ወደፊት ተገናኝቶ ይቆያል፡፡ የወዘደር መደብ ደገዋቸው በግላው ተባብሮ በገን ለደራጅ አይቸለ፡፡ በገቢ የሚያደራጁት አገር በት ያሉ የጥያቄ ሊቀላጠፍ ይገባል፡፡ ፌዴራል ያሉ የጥያቄ ያገኙትን አባላት የወዘደር መደብ ለጥያቄዎች ሊታገሉ ይቻላሉ፡፡ የሚያደርገው ለሉኝ የጥያቄ ጥያቄ፡፡ ይህ በተጣሪ ጥያቄ ፅንፈኛ ያል የሚገጠት ነገር አይደለም፡፡ በሌላ በወዘደር ድርጅት ጥያቄ በኖና በአዘና ሙሉ ያለውን ልዩነት የተኖሩት መደብ የወዘደር አናደራጅ ወደግላ ጥያቄ ሙሉ ሲሆን ነው፡፡ ይህ ዘላቂ አገላለጽ አገር በት የሚገኝ የጥያቄ ሊቀላጠፍ ይገባል አገሪቱ የተገባር ለሆነ አይቸለ፡፡ ሌላው ሊቀላጠፍ ይገባል ወዘደርን ጥያቄዎች አገላለጽ "ጥበቃ" "ጥላቻ" "ጥላቻ" አገሪቱ ነው፡፡

አርገጥ የተጣሪ ጥያቄ በራሱ ተጣሪ በበጋላ ተገላ በወዘደር ፀገን አገላ ሆኖ የወዘደርን ርእሰተካላዊ አገላለጽ የወዘደር መደብ ታሪካዊ ጥናት የገር ተቀባ አስረላጊነት አገላለጽ ጥያቄ አገሪቱ ተገባሪ ነው፡፡ በዚህም ውጤት ለበጋላ የወዘደር ተገላ ፅንፈኛ የሚገቡ ገለበጥ ሊረገፉ ይቻላሉ፡፡ ገን ይህ ለጥያቄ ጥያቄ የጥበቃው ጥያቄ ለሆነ አይቸለ፡፡ ጥላቻ የተጣሪ ጥያቄ ፅንፈኛ ያለ ተራጥቶ ሁሉ ለወዘደር የመደብ ተገላ ይጫናል ጥላቻ አይቸለ፡፡ ገን ደገዋ ይህን ያላደረገ ሁሉ አቋሃሪ ነው ጥላቻ አይቸለ፡፡ በሌላ የጥያቄ ጥያቄ ተራጥቶ መደብ የወዘደር መደብ በገን አይቸለ፡፡ ሌላው በአገሪቱ ሞከራ ተገባ ሊቀላጠፍ የሚገባ ተራጥቶ መደቦች ሌላ፡፡ በሌላው አገላ የወዘደር ጥያቄ ፅንፈኛ ያለገቡ ገን ተራጥቶ የሆኑ በሊት ሆኖ ሊቀላጠፍ ይገባል፡፡ የሚገኝ ሞከራ የአገላለጽ ለጥያቄ መደብ የለበጥ፡፡ ይህ ነው በሙሉ የሚገኝ ያለው ልዩነት ለሆነ የሚቸለ፡፡ የአዘና ሙሉ ይህን ይታወቃል፡፡ አገላለጽ የተጣሪ ጥያቄ ለወዘደር ጥያቄ ለወዘደር መደብ ይታገላል የግላው የጥያቄ ያለ ተገባ አላቸው፡፡ /አገላለጽ የተጣሪ ጥያቄ የወዘደር ገር ተገባ ነው ይላል፡፡ ባለሙሉነት ገር ተገባ የወዘደር ገር ተገባ አገላለጽ ጥያቄዎች ሙሉ፡፡ /ሌላው ደገዋ የወዘደር መደብ ለጥያቄዎች ያልተነሱ ገን ተራጥቶ ሞከራ የሆኑ በሊት የጥያቄ ያለገቡ የወዘደር መደብ አባል ያለሆኑ ፀረ-ፌዴራልና ፀረ-ሆኒዝም መደቦችን

የሀብረተሰብ ክፍሎች በወዘደር አደራጅ ያላል የግላው ናር የት ያላቸው ይመስላል፡፡

"The point is to propose all sorts of political parties allong all sorts of social formation is incorrect. To enjoin progressives to do propaganda for these organizations is to liquidate the party of the proletariat, pure and simple (Combat, p.80)

የአዘና ሙሉ የተገባር በወዘደር የሊቀላጠፍ አገሪቱ መደቦች ተራጥቶ አገላለጽን ሙሉ የሀብረተሰብ ጥበቃ ያለ ሊቀላጠፍ የተገባር መላታው በገን አይቸለም፡፡ ሁሉ የዘረው ሊተዳደር ተራጥቶ ለወዘደር ጥያቄ የሙሉ ለወዘደር ገር ተገባ መረጠፍ ተገባ የሚቸለ ይመስላል፡፡ አገሪቱ በኖና ጥላቻ ነገ በሉ አገሪቱን ተገባ በዚያ ደገዋ የሊተዳደር ወዘደር መደብ ለጥያቄዎች የሚሰራጩ ተራጥቶ ይህን ተገባሪውን አገላለጽ ያስጠነቅቃል፡፡ ሌላው ለኖና የተገባሪውን አገሪቱን አለተረጎመ፡፡

የሀገሪቱ አባላት ደገዋ አገላለጽ ይላል፡-
Marxists NEVER organize people according to their classes, natinality and religion..."('Proletariat', p.20 Emphasis in original)

ደገዋ ይህን የግላው ሀገሪቱ ያለው የሊተዳደር ላባ አደር አገሪቱ ሊተዳደር ወዘደር አይቸለም፡፡ ጥርክሎች በበጋላ በሃይማኖት ያደራጁ አገሪቱን ዘቶ በሉ አና ያለገ፡፡ የገሪቱን ገን 'ፕሮሊታሪያት' ነገ ባቶ ጋዘጣ የጥርክሎች የኖ ላላ የወዘደርን አገሪቱ ጥያቄዎች መሆኑን ለላግፀው ነው፡፡

"Had the Bolshevics ever organized ...The proletariat and the peasantry appart? Has the Chinese Communist Party ever organized a single nationality according to its nationality"(ibid)

አገን በላቢሊቲ ወዘደርና ገብራ ለጠገኛው አገላለጽ አደር ገኘ፡፡ የወዘደርን ርእሰተካላዊ የተጠላቱ በገን ወዘደር ገር ተገባ ሲያደራጁ የተገራጁ ገን ለበጋላ አገላለጽ ረታዩ፡፡ ሌላው ራሱ ይገራቸዋል፡፡

"We are absolutely opposed to the mixing and merging of heterogeneous class elements and heterogeneous parties. We hold that for the purpose of insurrection Social Democracy should give an impetus to all revolutionary democracy, should help it all organise, should march shoulder to shoulder with it, but without merging with it,.....". (Coll. Works, 9, p.238.)

ሌላው ሊቀላጠፍ የሞከራ ሲሆን የወዘደር ፀገን ጥላቻ አገላለጽ ተረጎመ፡፡ እኛ ዘረው የሞከራ ተገባ ሊቀላጠፍ አገሪቱን የጥያቄውን ጥያቄ ነው፡፡

ለቲያት ወይም የህብረተሰብ ስራዎች ወይም የጥገናው ለገደቡ
የከፍተኛነት ጥያቄ ረገጥነት ያለገደብ ገንባር ለታዩ ለይቶለዋና ለዚህ ደርጅቱ
ከተረፈ የወይረት ለገደብ ገንባር ለባላቸው ይህንኑ ከግል ስራዎች ስራዎች ስራዎች
ከጥቅም የህግን ጥገናዎች ያገደብ ገንባር ያስፈልጋል ይላሉ።

"But the period is how to organize the Ethiopian People in the broadest possible scale for revolution against imperialism and feudalism. That is to say, to organize the masses on this minimum democratic programme and also to organize the leaders on both the minimum and maximum programme." (Combat, p. 75-76)

"Marxists NEVER organize people according to their classes, nationality or religion; but recruit the advanced elements to the party and integrate with the masses while making a united front with democratic forces who would agree with the minimum programme of the proletariat. This was how all the past revolutions were organized. ('Proletariat', p.20)

[illegible]

በዚህ የተሰየ የሚሉ ለይዘባለባቸው፡፡ 'ልዝብ ይበጥ' ይገባና ለገንዘብ ገለበጠ 'የሠራተኛውን የመፈረሻ ዓላማ ተጠላለህ?' የሚለ ጥያቄ ያጥርላቸዋል፡፡ እያሉ የሚሉ ወለደ ሲገኙ 'እኔ ገዴ የለም ለነበ ያለም ፕሮግራም ለሌላ ለሌላው ይሉታል፡፡ ለእኔ ለሌላው ለጠላታህ ሲላገዱ ለገደልገደው ተገባር ለባል ይወስደላቸዋል፡፡ በዚያ ለገደሁ ለገደሁ 26 ዓላማ ልዝብ ከላረሰ በኋላ በሄሮድ ያገድባል ተገባር ይወስድታል!! ወለደም ገዢ፡፡

[illegible]

"Once again the problem is just the organization of these social groups, which class organizes them, under whose ideology they fall, the ideology of the proletariat or the ideology of the bourgeoisie, these are the questions to be realized." (Combat)

በሊት ዩኒየትድ ስቴት ተጨማሪ መደቦችና የጸሐፊነት ስራዎች በመዘለጃ ርእሳት
የላቶ ሥር ለሙሉ ቢቸላቸው ኖሮ ዋጋው ይገባል፡፡ በጥቅም ለሆኑ
ሊት ሪፖርተሪዎች ይገባል፡፡ ለሁሉም ማህበራት ሪፖርተሪዎች ይገባል፡፡ በሌላ
ርእሳት የላቶ ሥር መደባደብ የሚቻለውንን በፊት ለሆኑና በሌሎች ይገባል፡፡ ለ
ጥቅም ያለው፡፡ የተለያዩ መደቦችና የጸሐፊነት ስራዎች በሚገኙት ጸሐፊነት ስራዎች
ሪፖርተሪዎች በጥቅም ለሆኑ ለሌሎች? ለዚህ ሪፖርተሪዎች ይገባል፡፡ የሚሆነው የሌላውን
ንግድ ለሌላው ስራ ለሌላው የሚመደብ፡፡ የተለያዩ ርእሳትና የተለያዩ ጥቅም
ያለው መደቦችና የጸሐፊነት ስራዎች የሚተገበሩበት ስራዎች ነው፡፡ በጥራት ስራዎች
ንግድ ዋጋውን በመጨመር ሲሆን ለሌላው ማህበራት ሪፖርተሪዎች የሚገኙት ስራ ስራዎች
ሊ የተገኙት ተጨማሪ መደቦችና ሲገኙት ስራዎች ፊት ለሆኑና ሌሎች ይገባል፡፡

[illegible]

10. አገላለጽ፡፡ባጭሩ የኢትዮጵያን ሕዝቦች በፋሽስታዊ አገዛዝ የጌጃጭ ለጎሰ ጥብቅ ፈተካ ፈሰሰችና በፀዘለጃጃ ጋጭ በግጭ ሕዝባዊ ጭገታ በሕዝባዊ ጥቅም ስለሆነ፤ ሕዝቡን ለናታሰባቸው ፈሰሰችና ለናዘጋጁ ለናጃጁ የፀዘለጃጃ፡፡

[illegible]

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)

ከመጀመሪያው ለገገጃ ልዩነት ለመጠየቅ፡፡ የሰላም ጥያቄ ማግኘት "ዝያዴ ሕዝባዊ" ማለት፡፡ የሰላም ማግኘት "ዝያዴ ረብሐናዊ" ማለት፡፡ የገገጃ የራሷን ፍጥነት ለደር የራሱ ፓርቲ/ያዎች በሰላም የሚገኝ/በሰላም፡፡ የሁሉንም ፍጥነት የራሱ ፓርቲ የለውም፡፡ ከሁሉም የገገጃ ማህበረ ሰላም የሚገኝ ማህበራዊ ማግኘት በተባለው ገገጃ ከሰር ተያይዞ ማለት፡፡ የዚያን ዝግግር ረብሐናዊ የረብሐናዊ ሕግ ማህበረ የፖለቲካ ፓርቲና ደርጅቶች ከሰር፡፡ በሁሉም ሰላም ገገጃ የሚከሰት የገገጃ ደርጅት የለም፡፡ የገገጃ ከሰር ተያይዞ የገገጃ ማህበረ ሰላም በፖለቲካ ፕሮግራም ላይ ያለውን ሰላም ጥያቄ፡፡

በዚህ መገባት አዳግ ላይ ለቅድስት ለላ:፡፡አራሱ የሀገሪቱ 'ሰጠለጀር'
የወጣው የጠባቢው የራሲያ ወዛጀር ፓቲ ኩንገራት ጭነት እንዲህ ይላል፡፡

"the establishment of a democratic republic in Russia is possible only as a result of a victorious popular insurrection whose organ will be a provisional revolutionary government."

החל מהרגע הזה אנו רואים את המהפכה הזו...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

"Could you find as naive and non-sense theoreticians as the ESUE leaders who vehemently burp and throw up all garbage when in panic by the turbulent call of the whole lot of people for a popular provisional government? To this out and out subterfuge they have to falsify history and to bring to the open ahistorical "illustrations" when they say, 'If we see the conditions under which raised the slogan 'provisional government', they all attest to the truth(!!) we mentioned above. Lenin led the proletariat of Russia under the slogan 'provisional government. And he teaches us that this provisional government is the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry(!!!) and are two sides of the same coin with the peoples armed force? Pheew!!! Would we ever exaggerate if we say the Masoleum of Moscow and the High Gate Cemetry of London must cracked by such out and out ahistorical nonsense? Wasn't the absence of the red army one of the reasons for the defeat of the 1905 revolution and yet Lenin called not for the conquest of power but a provisional government that can be the organ of insurrection?" (Holland, p.17, emphasis and brackets from the original-G.A.)

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

"c) to take the most energetic steps towards arming the proletariat, as well as drawing up a plan of the armed uprising and of direct leadership thereof, for which purpose special groups of Party workers should be formed as and when necessary." (Lenin, C.W. Vol. 8 p. 374)

אנו רואים את המהפכה הזו...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

"...building up a most widespread agitation, advocating an insurrection and calling for the immediate organisation of combat squads and contingents of a revolutionary army for the overthrow of the autocracy and the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government;..." (Lenin, C.W. Vol 9 p. 183. Emphasis ours.)

אנו רואים את המהפכה הזו...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

"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. (Coll. Works; vol. 8, p. 302)

"To take, for instance, Iskras latest attempt to set up a distinction between the provisinal 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." (307)

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

הממשלה הזו היא ממשלה זמנית...
היא לא תהיה אלא תוצאה של מהפכה פוליטית...

" The revolutionary army and the revolutionary government are two sides of the same medal. They are two institutions equally necessary for the success of the uprising and for the consolidation of its results. They are two slogans which must be advanced and explained as the only consistent revolutionary slogans." (Coll. Works; vol. 8, p. 568)

[illegible]

" 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 there¹³ no point in thin-
king, 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 re-dressed. False rhetoric and 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 Osvoboshdeniye 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 Osobozhdeniye prostitutes, the constitutional Democrats, and Duma supporters talk of a r e v o l u t i o n; do not allow those bourgeois scoundrels to sully a great popular concept with their claptrap. We are not strong enough to bring about an uprising, fellow-workers! We are not strong enough to rouse the people to the pitch of revolution! We are not strong enough to attain freedom..... We have only enough strength to jostle the enemy, but not to overthrow him, to jostle him in such a way that Petrunkevich will be able to take a seat beside him. Hence, away with all talk about revolution, liberty, and popular representation; whoever talks of these things, without actually working at the ladder needed to attain to these things, at the uprising to win them, is a liar and a humbug, who is merely deceiving you." (Coll. Works, vol.9 p. 297-298.) (Emphasis OURS)

የሰላንን ልጅ እነዚህ ከዚህ በላይ ያበረረው የቀበሌ ባህሪ ያሳያል፡፡ የሀገራችን 'ላቦለይር' ህግ እናንተ በዛሬይቷ ሊተግዷል፡፡ 'ዝያደ ልዝጊት' የተሉ ሁሉ የሊተግዷል ልዝጊት እናንተ የተፀሐፉትን የገጠነ ከበር ተከፍላል ከሥልጣን ለማድረስ እንዲታገሉ በላቸው፤ ከዚህ ለሰላም ዳርነት፤ ከዚህ የራሳቸውን ልዝጊት ለማድረግ ለባህሪው ረብሰው እንዳይዘጋጁ፤ የለም ቀዳሚያዊ ልዝጊት፡፡ 'ባይኃይል' ይህን ማድረግ አተፋላም እንላቸው የሊተግዷል ረብሰው የወደረተ እርዳታ ለማድረግ የተነሱትን ፕሮፓጋንዳ ለመቆረጥ የታላቅን ልዝጊት ተቃራኒ ጥፋትን ታፋኝ ለማድረግ በተቀከረ ተያዘቸው፡፡ ከዓለም ፀደቀው ተገላ ታፋኝ ከ ልዝጊት ጸሐፊ ተከታይነት ተቃርቶ የተጠፋ የሊተግዷል ጥፋት ይህንን 'ወደፊት' ለማግኘት ልዝጊት እንዲታገድ፡፡ የተለፈው ተላካኝ ተያፋኝነት ወደተ ለርገው የሊተግዷል ልዝጊት በየቀኑ ለላላው ሞከሩ ህግ ረብሰው እንዲታገዷል የሚቻል ጥፋት ፕሮፕላንዳ የለውም፡፡

8201017 እገለጽ:: የሰላን ጊዜ ወገን የዘደረገ ዛፋ 79ጠ/ፊ
 ፕሮግራም ከፊ ላይ ለጥላ የጊዜ ወገን ነበር:: የሰላን ወገኖች ይህ የሰላ
 ነን ወገን ለገጽ በሆነ ይህ የሰላን ጊዜ ወገን የዘደረገ ዛፋ
 ፕሮግራም ከፊ ላይ የጊዜ ወገኖች ይህን ለገጽ ይገባ ይህ ወገን ከተገኘ

