

Oppose the Counter-Revolutionary Meddling of the Soviet Revisionist Renegade Clique in the Ethiopian Revolution (Part II)

Workers' Advocate, Vol. 7, #5, October 1, 1977

This is the second and concluding installment in the serialization by The Workers' Advocate of the Statement of the Central Committee of the Ethiopian Students Union in North America (ESUNA) which came out under the above title in Vol. VI, No. 2, of the Journal Combat dated March 1977. The first part of this statement appeared in The Workers' Advocate of August 1, 1977. This excellent statement provides vivid material exposing Soviet revisionism and the aggressive meddling of the Soviet New Tsars in Ethiopia. It shows how the Soviet revisionists collaborate with the fascist Mengistu regime, praise its suppression of the people and outrageously slander the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party, and the statement refutes a number of revisionist theories, such as the road of "non-capitalist development" to socialism.

Today in Ethiopia both superpowers, U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, are competing with each other to strangle the Ethiopian revolution and keep Ethiopia as an object of plunder and control by the world system of imperialism. In our opinion, this is a good example refuting the opportunist theses of those who have capitulated to one superpower on the plea of allegedly fighting the other superpower, but who are really fighting the revolution. The Statement by ESUNA restricts itself to criticizing the Soviet revisionists. But, in our opinion, the statement's description of Soviet meddling and refutation of the Soviet revisionist theses provide good material to illustrate the utterly reactionary nature of the social-

chauvinist and revisionist theories that are creating disunity in the U.S. Marxist-Leninist movement.

There are those revisionist yellow journalists who claim that although the Soviet Union may have bad intentions, nevertheless it is much weaker than U.S. imperialism and thus out of selfish reasons it will aid the liberation movements. On this plea, they prettify Soviet aggression and subversion and seek to impose revisionist sabotage on the people's movements. The situation in Ethiopia refutes this fallacy. The Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party is valiantly fighting the U.S. imperialist-dominated Ethiopian regime. The Soviet social-imperialists did not, however, back the EPRP in order to weaken the U.S. imperialists. On the contrary, they seek influence among the reactionary classes in Ethiopia, among the classes which are the local base of imperialist domination, and help these classes attempt to suppress the Ethiopian revolution and the Eritrean national liberation struggle. The Soviet social-imperialists seek influence on the basis of being better able to suppress the revolution than the U.S. imperialists, thus showing once again that Soviet social-imperialism is an aggressive superpower.

There are also those U.S. great-power social- \ chauvinists who deny the existence of the U.S. neo-colonial empire, prettify the U.S. imperialist puppets around the world, take refuge under the U.S. nuclear umbrella and oppose revolution. Exposure of the Soviet revisionist theses distorting the class character of the Ethiopian regime and of the revisionist "road of non-capitalist development" also strikes straight at the heart of U.S. social chauvinism and of its denial of the existence of U.S. neo-colonies. Both Soviet revisionism and U.S. social-chauvinism prettify the same fascist Mengistu and paint imperialist lackeys as "anti-imperialist fighters". Both theories negate the road of the

new-democratic revolution. Both hold that the way out for the neo-colonies is to develop the productive forces by a series of reforms within the old neo-colonial system. Of course, U.S. social-chauvinism is adapted to serving U.S. imperialist interests, while the road of "non-capitalist development" is advocated by the New Tsars, but their theoretical and ideological basis is similar. This is no accident, as revisionism is the main danger in the international communist movement. This exposes U.S. social-chauvinism as revisionist and opportunist and totally opposed to Marxism-Leninism.

We hold that everyone should pay attention to the developments in Ethiopia. We are convinced that by committing aggression in Ethiopia, the Soviet social-imperialists are only putting a noose around their neck, and the revolutionary masses led by the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party will give them the same beating that they are administering to the U.S. imperialists.

IV

STATE OWNERSHIP OF INDUSTRY

The complete departure of the Soviet revisionists from fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is also manifested in their attitude to and analysis of the nationalization measures of the Ethiopian Military Junta.

The nationalization measures being referred to are the expropriation by the Junta of 80 industrial enterprises and 20 banks, financial establishments and insurance companies formerly owned by foreign capital, the royal family and the aristocracy; the take-over by the state of the main shares in 29 industrial and commercial enterprises, which were largely owned by foreign capital; and the

nationalization by the state of all land and superfluous houses and reduction of rent in urban areas.

The military Junta took all these reform measures under the pressure of the people's revolutionary struggle.

Now how do the Soviet revisionists appraise these measures?

Boris Asoyan, a special correspondent of the Soviet New Times magazine shamelessly claimed that these measures placed "hundreds of leading firms" "under the people's control". (New Times, December, 1976 #51, p. 25).

Lauding these measures sky-high and obliterating the distinction between reform and revolution, Soviet revisionists also claim that the above-mentioned measures have placed Ethiopia "on the non-capitalist road of development, toward socialism".

Yesefew Hizb Dimtz, which is the voice of revisionism in Ethiopia, echoed this same fallacy when it said:

"Those measures (i.e. the takeover of industries by the state) follow the path of socialism".

Here, the Soviet revisionists and their domestic servants expose their complete bankruptcy and their complete ignorance of elementary Marxist theory.

Elementary Marxist theory teaches that the character of state property depends on the class holding state power. This fact was pointed out by Engels a century ago in his works, "Anti-Duhring" and "Socialism; Utopian and Scientific".

In these works, Engels clearly elucidated the point that state ownership is always the ownership of that class which

holds state power. And therefore, he showed that as long as the state power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie, state ownership, too, can be none other than a form of bourgeois ownership.

This principle is universally applicable and, of course, applicable to Ethiopia, too.

In Ethiopia, state-power is, obviously, not in the hands of the people, but in the hands of the imperialists and the domestic lackeys. Far from holding state-power, the people are, in fact, deprived of all democratic rights and are subjected to incessant and savage persecution and exploitation.

In view of this, it is crystal clear that the military regime's takeover of some industries formerly owned by foreign monopoly capital and the domestic reactionaries did not give birth to "people's control" of the means of production. This is concretely manifested in the fact that the state owned enterprises do not belong to the people, are not managed by the people, and are not run for the benefit of the people. Quite in the contrary, these enterprises are owned by the bureaucrat-capitalists, are managed by them and are run in their interest.

These are indisputable facts.

So, when the Soviet revisionists claim that these enterprises are controlled by "the people", they glaringly expose the fact that their concept "people" is completely alien to the Marxist-Leninist concept of "people".

According to Marxism-Leninism, the class-content of the term "people" in the historical conditions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, is "the proletariat and the peasantry, if we take the main, big forces and distribute the rural and

urban petty-bourgeoisie (also part of the 'people') between the two". (Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution, p. 52)

This means that according to Marxism-Leninism "the people" are essentially the workers and the peasants, and "people's" ownership is essentially the collective ownership of the workers and peasants, and "people's" control of the economy is essentially control by the workers and peasants.

Evidently, the Soviet revisionists do not agree with this. For them the "people" are the bourgeoisie, "people's ownership" is bourgeois ownership, and "people's control" of the economy is bourgeois control of the economy.

What a glaring self-exposure!

The Soviet claim that state-ownership of industry in Ethiopia has ushered in the "non-capitalist road of development towards socialism" is yet another self exposure.

This absurd claim is based on the revisionist theory which mechanically equates private property with capitalism and state ownership with socialism.

According to this "theory", when a sizable sector of the means of production are property of the state (even of bourgeois state), capitalist relations are suppressed and an "anti-capitalist" or "non-capitalist" road is ushered in.

Here again, it is not superfluous to note that Engels has long ago pointed out that nationalization by a non-proletarian state does not lead to socialism. In this respect, Engels pointed out that the more the bourgeois state takes over the means of production, "the more it becomes a real aggregate capitalist, the more citizens it exploits. The

workers remain wage workers, proletarians. The capital relationship is not abolished, rather it is pushed to its limit" (Engels, Anti-Duhring, Foreign Languages Press, 1970, p. 360).

Engels' conclusions are borne out by the reality in Ethiopia. The nationalization measures carried out by the Junta greatly strengthened the power of the state. However, they have not ended the production relations in which the workers in industrial enterprises, commercial farms, public utilities, etc., are subjected to capitalist exploitation, wage-slavery and oppression.

As a matter of fact, the economic plight of the workers in enterprises owned by the state, or by foreign monopoly capital or by both the state and foreign monopoly capital, is deteriorating every day.

Apart from being victimized by food shortages and shortages (or complete disappearance) of many staple commodities from the market, the working class and other working people also suffer from sky-rocketing inflation. For example, the retail price index in Addis Abeba rose by 22.5% between October, 1975 and March, 1976, giving an annual rate of 50%. Over the 15 month period up to March last year, the rate was 30% and there is no doubt that the rate has increased since then. Due to this sky-rocketing inflation, the real wages of the working class and their purchasing power is falling every day.

Under the reign of the military regime, the unemployment problem, too, has gotten worse than ever. Since the regime spends the revenues of the state for buying tanks and planes, and for waging a costly war in Eritrea, it has not been able to open new job opportunities for the people. Also, mass dismissal of revolutionary workers from

industries and public utilities takes place regularly. Consequently, the ranks of the unemployed has swollen to alarming proportions.

All in all, despite the nationalization measures, the working class in Ethiopia still lives a life of poverty, destitution and misery; without adequate food, shelter, clothing and political rights.

Such is the stark reality in Ethiopia. Thus, to describe the reality as the "non-capitalist road to socialism" is nothing but downright betrayal of socialism and defense of bourgeois reaction and exploitation.

V

LAND REFORM

The bourgeois revisionist class stand of the Soviet press is also manifest in its analysis of the land reform program of the military Junta.

The reform program being referred to is the one entitled "Proclamation Providing for the Nationalization of Rural Land", which was issued on March 4, 1975.

This proclamation called for confiscation without compensation of all rural land, most of which was previously held by the royal family, the aristocracy and feudal landlords. The Proclamation said:

"all rural land shall be the collective property of the Ethiopian people", "the relationship between landlord and tenant shall be abolished" and that "without differentiation of sexes, any person who is willing to personally cultivate land shall be allotted land sufficient for his maintenance and that of his family". The proclamation also said that

peasant associations will be formed to implement the decree and later organize cooperative farming.

The chief sins committed by Soviet journals in analyzing the above-mentioned proclamation boil down to the following:

(1) They see the land reform proclamation not as a by-product of the revolutionary class struggle of the peasantry but as a "gift" of the Junta to the masses;

(2) they pass in silence the numerous atrocities committed by the Junta to hamper the implementation of the agrarian reform law and

(3) they gloss over or ignore the bloody class struggle which was waged by the masses to implement the reform and defend the gains of their struggle.

For example, if we read through various issues of the Soviet New Times magazine, we will get the following picture of the agrarian reform: The military regime seized power in September, 1974, and after a few months in power, "launched an all-out offensive against feudalism"; the March, 1975 proclamation "put an end to feudal land ownership and gave land to the tillers". "The peasants' dream is coming true: an end has been put to big landlord estates and land is being given to those who till it"; the military regime "made the land collective property and delivered from slavery millions of peasants who under the monarchy were at the bottom of the social ladder"; "millions of hectares of land have already been turned over to the peasants", etc.

From the above, it is clear that the Soviet revisionists see the land reform not as a by-product of the revolutionary

class struggle of the people,' but as a gift to the masses by the Junta "to deliver them from slavery".

The truth, however, is just the opposite.

The regime did not issue the land reform program because of its benevolence to the masses. It was actually compelled to issue the proclamation by the fierce class struggle of the peasants which had reached insurrectionary levels in the wake of the February Upsurge.

This could be seen in the fact that, at the time the Junta seized power, the whole countryside was ablaze with the greatest agrarian revolt in Ethiopian history. In the rural areas, particularly in the south, peasants were taking over landlord estates, burning granaries, besieging governors' mansions, driving off tyrant officials and were even organizing their own militias, tribunals and organs of power. Clearly, it was this volcanic and irrepressible agrarian upsurge which compelled the regime to issue the agrarian reform law.

But apparently, the Soviet revisionists do not see the people's revolutionary struggle as the single real moving force of history; so they have chosen to ignore it altogether.

Another thing which Soviet journals have ignored or passed in silence is the widespread outrage perpetrated by the Derg to hamper the implementation of the reform. Here are some examples:

The issuing by the Junta of various internal circulars with the clear intention of amending or postponing certain parts of the proclamation are passed in complete silence.

The Junta's atrocious crimes against Zemetcha students and teachers (e.g. arrest, torture and execution of Zemetcha

students, putting them, en masse, in concentration camps and subjecting them to inhuman and disgusting punishments, etc...) are passed in complete silence.

The Junta's heinous crimes against peasants and their associations (e.g., physically liquidating revolutionary peasant leaders, dismantling autonomous peasant associations, disarming peasant militias, mass bombing of villages, pardoning feudal bandits rampaging the countryside... etc....) are passed in silence.

Apart from all the above, Soviet journals also pass in silence the bloody class struggles which were waged by the peasantry, both against rampaging feudal reactionaries and against the Junta's police and bureaucracy, to implement the reform and defend the gains of their struggles. Thus, the independent actions of the peasantry such as disarming feudalists, organizing militias, administering justice on feudal bandits, chasing away Junta officials... etc... are all ignored by Soviet journals.

VI

"NON-CAPITALIST ROAD" TO SOCIALISM

Thus far, we have shown how Soviet revisionists adulterate and distort Marxist principles in their analysis of the class character of the state-power in Ethiopia, the question of nationalization of industries, the question of state capitalism and the question of land reform.

Here, it must be emphasized that the errors which the Soviet revisionists commit on these series of questions are not isolated but represent an interconnected and integral part of their whole anti-socialist theory and program for negating revolution in neocolonial countries. The "new" theory and program which the Soviet revisionists have

dished up to oppose revolution in neo-colonial countries is what is called the "non-capitalist road of development to socialism".

According to the Soviet revisionists, the countries of Africa and Asia that had been marching along "the non-capitalist road of development to socialism" for many years, include such neo-colonial states as Egypt, Burma, Syria and Somalia.

Now, the Soviet revisionists claim that Ethiopia, under the military regime, has joined this group of countries, and is advancing to socialism along the "new road", namely the "non-capitalist road", which allegedly leads to socialism without the leading role of the working class (and its Communist Party), without a people's democratic revolution and without the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Below, we will show that the so-called "new road", being loudly advertised by the Soviet revisionists, completely negates the correct road to achieve socialism in neo-colonial countries.

What is the correct road to achieve socialism in neo-colonial countries?

According to Marxism-Leninism, socialism can be achieved only through the road of proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat; and in the case of neo-colonial countries like Ethiopia, it can be achieved only by first completing the transitional stage of New Democratic Revolution. The transitional stage of New Democratic Revolution can be completed only when the proletariat (through its Communist Party) leads the masses on the road of the people's armed struggle against armed counter-revolution, only when feudalism, imperialism and bureaucrat capitalism are overthrown, and only when the

old bureaucratic and military apparatuses are smashed and the people's democratic state established.

This is the only road for achieving socialism in neo-colonial countries as has been proven by the historical experiences of the Chinese, Cambodian and other revolutions which took place in neo-colonial countries.

There is not the slightest doubt that, the general laws derived from the historical experience of these revolutions have universal significance.

However, the Soviet revisionists, by speculating with certain changes in the world situation and with certain specific features of the newly independent states, have completely discarded this road of achieving socialism even though its correctness has been proven by practice. In its place, they have substituted the "new road" which they claim to have discovered, namely, the "non-capitalist road".

According to proponents of this "new road", there is no need for present day neo-colonial countries like Ethiopia to have a new-democratic revolution there is no need for the proletariat (and its Communist Party) to lead the revolution; there is no need to adopt the people's armed struggle as the main form of struggle; there is no need to smash the bourgeois state machine and there is no need to establish the people's democratic state.

Instead, the Soviet revisionists claim that socialism can be built in neo-colonial countries gradually and peacefully, merely through a succession of reforms. The succession of reforms which will allegedly lead these neo-colonial countries to socialism are said to be: "the restriction of foreign monopoly capital through gradual nationalization", "the regulation of small and medium national capital", "the creation of a profitable state sector", "the assignment of

national cadres to key government posts", "carrying out agrarian reform", "issuing progressive labor legislations", etc. (V. Solodovnikov, Non-Capitalist Development, An Historical Outline).

From the above, it is crystal clear that the Soviet revisionists have reduced the entire content of the struggle for socialism in neo-colonial countries to a series of reforms within the framework of neo-colonialism. This means that the Soviet revisionists have rejected the road of proletarian revolution and have substituted for it the road of counter-revolutionary bourgeois reformism.

Since the Soviet revisionists reject the road of revolution and uphold the road of counter-revolutionary bourgeois reformism, it is not at all surprising that they also reject the possibility and necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle for socialism.

In this respect, the Soviet revisionist openly propagates the counter-revolutionary fallacy that the struggle for socialism in neo-colonial countries can be led by non-proletarian classes and strata such as the national bourgeoisie, the petty-bourgeoisie and the "middle strata of the military". They also say, in the "new" world situation in which a "powerful socialist camp" exists, bourgeois state powers (such as those in Burma, Ethiopia, etc..) can carry out anti-capitalist policies and can become the bearers of the ideals of socialism and leaders of its realization.

Since the Soviet revisionists completely reject the road of proletarian revolution and uphold the road of bourgeois reformism, it is not surprising that they also reject class struggle and preach class collaboration; it is not surprising that they also negate violent revolution and preach peaceful transition; and it is not surprising that they also reject the

necessity to smash the bourgeois state machine and uphold "structural reform".

All these "new" theories, ideas and strategies are a component part of the so-called "non-capitalist road" of development which the Soviet revisionists have invented with the sinister, motive of spreading ideological confusion, turning the masses of neo-colonial countries from the road of revolution, subverting their aspirations for socialism and perpetuating the neo-colonial order in a new guise.

But, in an attempt to cover up their ulterior motive and in order to seal their counter-revolutionary merchandise under a socialist label, the Soviet revisionists have dished up all sorts of deceitful theses and arguments.

Below, we select just three main arguments of theirs for exposure and repudiation.

First; In order to deny the possibility and necessity of proletarian leadership of the revolution in neo-colonial countries, Soviet revisionists use the argument that the working class in such countries is "small in number", "primitive", etc. Using this as a pretext, they vigorously advocate the idea that the revolution can and must be led by the national bourgeoisie, or the petty-bourgeoisie or the intelligentsia, etc....

As is well known, this argument of the Soviet revisionists was long ago refuted by Lenin in a polemic against Kautsky.

In refuting Kautsky's fallacy, Lenin pointed out that the small number of the working class cannot be used as a pretext for denying the leading role of the proletariat. He proved, on the basis of Marxist theory, that the leading role of the proletariat does not depend on its numerical strength

but on its objective, social, economic, and political condition within capitalist society.

Practice is the criterion for testing truth.

The great victory of the October Revolution in Russia as well as the victories of the Chinese, Albanian and other revolutions, proved the complete bankruptcy of the argument peddled by Kautsky to forbid the proletariat from making revolution.

At the same time, they proved the correctness of Lenin's theory that the proletarian party can be founded and emerge in the forefront of the revolutionary struggle even when the working class represents a very small per cent of the country's population.

Therefore, when the Soviet revisionists use the "small number" of the working class in neo-colonial countries, as a pretext for denying its leading role, they are simply trying to resurrect a rotten argument that has long gone bankrupt.

Second; Soviet revisionists say that the conditions for an immediate socialist revolution do not exist in neo-colonial countries. From this premise, they draw the conclusion that neo-colonial countries must take the "non-capitalist road of development" in order to prepare the basis for a socialist society.

For example, a Soviet "expert" in this field defines the "non-capitalist road" as "the revolutionary process by which the national liberation struggle gradually and consistently develops into a socialist revolution in countries where the conditions for an immediate socialist revolution have not yet matured". (Non-Capitalist Development, An Historical Outline).

The same "expert" says elsewhere; "The non-capitalist way is, above all, the way of creating the material prerequisite for the building of a socialist society".

Clearly, this argument in defense of the "non-capitalist way" is sheer revisionist nonsense.

It is an undeniable fact that in neo-colonial countries, the prerequisites for an immediate socialist revolution do not exist.

But it does not follow from this that the way out is to embark on the "non-capitalist road" of development.

Here again, practice is the criterion for truth.

As has been proved by the practice of the Chinese and other revolutions in semi-colonial countries, the Way out lies in waging the New Democratic Revolution as a transitional stage for the subsequent socialist revolution.

As Mao said;

"The democratic revolution is the necessary preparation for the socialist revolution, and the socialist revolution is the inevitable trend of the democratic revolution."

In other words, the road of preparing the pre-conditions for the socialist revolution under neo-colonial conditions is not the "non-capitalist road" but the New Democratic Road.

Therefore, when the Soviet revisionists peddle with their theory of "non-capitalist road", they are openly repudiating the possibility and necessity of waging the New Democratic Revolution as a necessary preparation for the socialist revolution.

Third; The Soviet revisionists also use the reactionary theory of productive forces in defense of the "non-capitalist road".

According to this reactionary fallacy, "socialist revolution is impossible and the socialist road cannot be taken in any country where capitalism is not highly developed and the productive forces have not reached a high level". (Peking Review #19, 1964 P. 8.)

Therefore, it is said that the way out for backward neo-colonial countries is to develop the productive forces by a series of reforms within the framework of the old neo-colonial order.

Such is the essence of the so-called "non-capitalist road of development" advertised by the Soviet revisionists.

Is this prescription in accord with the Marxist-Leninist law of social development?

No. It is not.

Marxism-Leninism recognizes that productive forces and the economic base in general, play the principal and decisive role in relation to production relations and the superstructure. But, at the same time, Marxism-Leninism affirms that once the old relations of production and political superstructure have outlived their usefulness and turned decadent, a qualitatively higher development of productive forces can take place only after a revolution in the superstructure and the-relations of production.

As Chairman Mao said:

"When it is impossible for the productive forces to develop without a change in the relations of production,

then the change in the relations of production plays the principal and decisive role", "and when the superstructure.. obstructs the development of the economic base, political... changes become principal and decisive."

The process of transformation of the old backward, semi-feudal and semi-colonial China into the advanced socialist New China eloquently proves the validity of this law.

Old China, like many neo-colonial countries of the present time, was a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country in which the productive forces were at a very low level and had long stagnated. This resulted mainly from the cruel oppression by imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat capitalism and also from the preponderance of comprador feudal relations.

The Chinese people were able to enormously develop their productive forces and overcome their backwardness only after the proletariat (through its Communist Party) led the masses (mainly the peasant masses) in carrying out the New Democratic Revolution and following its victory, shifted over to the socialist revolution and socialist construction without let up.

This historical experience proves the fundamental law of social development that only by first creating revolutionary public opinion seizing state power and then changing the relations of production, is it possible to greatly develop the productive forces.

Clearly, the so-called "non-capitalist road of development" hawked by the Soviet revisionists, is in irreconcilable opposition to this fundamental law of social development. As has been stated before, this reactionary theory openly negates the leading role of the proletariat and its party, it negates class struggle; and it negates revolution.

Instead, it reduces the entire theory and practice of the struggle for socialism to a series of practical reforms carried out by a bourgeois state power within the framework of neocolonialism.

This means that the so-called "theory of non-capitalist development" completely denies that the proletariat's consciously making revolution under the guidance of revolutionary theory, seizing political power and changing the relations of production is the only road for greatly developing the productive forces in neo-colonial countries and pushing social development ahead.

All this shows clearly that the "theory of non-capitalist development" is an out-and-out counter-revolutionary fallacy.

SOME FINAL REMARKS

In this short statement, we have attempted to make a limited exposure of how the Soviet revisionists distort the Ethiopian reality, how they seek to whitewash the monstrous crimes of the military Junta, how they fanatically hate the Marxist-Leninist Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party and hurl on it infamous calumnies and slander, how they disseminate out-and-out counter-revolutionary fallacies on a series of fundamental problems of the Ethiopian revolution, how they attempt to spread ideological confusion by preaching the so-called "non-capitalist road of development" and how all this reflects the growing counter-revolutionary collusion of the Soviet revisionists and the Military Junta.

We hope this limited exposure of the counter-revolutionary theories and deeds and ulterior motives of the Soviet revisionists will make people keenly aware of the

necessity and urgency of firmly opposing and thoroughly criticizing the Soviet revisionists.

We think that in a situation where the Soviets are fiercely contending with the U.S. imperialists for sphere of influence in Ethiopia, and in a situation where they are directly colluding with the domestic reactionaries in an attempt to sabotage the people's revolutionary struggle, there can be no road other than the road of revolution which recognizes the necessity of merciless onslaught against all counterrevolutionary forces and their poisonous views.

We think we live in a period in which it is impossible to raise a single serious political question in Ethiopia, or in Djibouti, or in the Horn of Africa, or for that matter, anywhere in the globe, without having to come to grips with the real nature and intentions of not only the U.S. imperialists, but also the Soviet revisionists.

Therefore, the Central Committee of the Ethiopian Students Union in North America, calls upon all chapters and study groups to resolutely carry out the task of combating and exposing Soviet revisionism.

At the present conjuncture, it is of particular importance to undertake the following tasks.

First: The slanderous and counter-revolutionary propaganda being carried out by the Soviet press against the E.P.R.P. must be firmly opposed and thoroughly criticized.

Second: The campaign by the Soviet press to prettify and embellish the diabolical rule of the Fascist Mengistu Haile Mariam regime and distort the reality in Ethiopia must be unswervingly and consistently opposed and combated.

Third: The out-and-out counter-revolutionary theories being propagated by the Soviet revisionists (such as the "non-capitalist road", the theory of productive forces, the theory of peaceful transition, the theory of structural reform, etc.) must be criticized and repudiated in a deep-going, all-round and sustained way.

Fourth: The activities and deeds of the Soviet revisionists and U.S. imperialists in Ethiopia, Somalia and the neighboring regions should be closely followed, monitored and studied. On this basis, their counterrevolutionary and hegemonistic ambitions, desires, tricks, plots and conflicts must be exposed in a sustained way.

Fifth: The origin and development of differences in the International Communist Movement, as well as the real nature of present-day Soviet Union, Cuba, etc., must be studied in a systematic and concentrated manner.

Finally, we call upon all chapters and study groups to carry out these tasks as an inseparable part of their struggle against feudalism, imperialism and all reaction.

GLORY TO THE E.P.R.P./E.P.R.A.!

DOWN WITH IMPERIALISM!

DOWN WITH REVISIONISM!

DOWN WITH ALL REACTION!