

Re: Rejection of the "Ethiopian Peoples' Forces Alliance for Survival" from an Oromo Nationalist View

Advocacy for Oromia hereby issues this formal statement to articulate its categorical rejection of the so-called "Ethiopian Peoples' Forces Alliance for Survival." This rejection is grounded in a thorough analysis of the alliance's foundational assumptions, its treatment of Oromo historical grievances, and its strategic objectives. Advocacy for Oromia concludes that the aforementioned alliance is not beneficial for the Oromo people, and this statement sets forth the reasons for that conclusion.

I. Failure to Acknowledge the Historical Suffering of the Oromo People

The alliance does not genuinely believe in or acknowledge the harm that has persisted for years against the Oromo people. This harm includes, but is not limited to, land dispossession, political marginalization, cultural suppression, and economic exploitation under successive Ethiopian regimes—the imperial era, the Derg regime, the EPRDF administration, and continuing under the current government.

While the alliance document employs generic language regarding "immense suffering," "widespread displacement," and "destruction and death," it conspicuously avoids naming the Oromo people as a specific victim of systemic oppression. This omission is not accidental; it reflects a deliberate refusal to centre Oromo historical trauma within the alliance's political framework.

Advocacy for Oromia maintains that any political coalition that does not explicitly acknowledge and centre the specific historical grievances of the Oromo people is inherently suspect and cannot be trusted to advance Oromo interests.

II. Refusal to Accept the Wounds of Past Systems of Oppression

The alliance refuses to accept the reality of systemic oppression inflicted upon the Oromo people by past regimes. This refusal manifests in the alliance's framing of the current crisis as a departure from an otherwise acceptable historical trajectory, rather than as the culmination of centuries of Oromo subjugation.

The alliance positions itself as a broad-based coalition against the *current* regime, while declining to demand accountability for *past* systems. This approach reflects a fundamental strategic disagreement within Ethiopian opposition politics: whether to prioritize unity against a common enemy or to insist upon historical justice as a precondition for any alliance.

Advocacy for Oromia unequivocally adopts the latter position. Without acknowledging past wrongs, any coalition risks reproducing the same structural injustices that have historically subjugated the Oromo people. Formal recognition of Oromo rights within a reformed Ethiopian state is insufficient; what is required is transformative justice that addresses the structural legacy of Oromo dispossession.

III. Political Opportunism Rather Than Genuine Problem-Solving

The alliance is not founded to solve the country's problems but rather to play political games. This is the most serious charge against the alliance, and Advocacy for Oromia asserts it without equivocation.

The alliance's inclusion of multiple ethnic groups, its call for armed struggle, and its specific demands for self-determination for various peoples—Amhara, Oromo, Tigray, Afar, Somali, Benishangul-Gumuz, and Gambella—collectively constitute an ethnic-federal framework that superficially accommodates Oromo demands while failing to address the fundamental historical injustice against the Oromo people. This framework offers only formal recognition, not substantive transformation.

Advocacy for Oromia rejects any pan-Ethiopian initiative that does not subordinate itself to Oromo nationalist priorities. The alliance's refusal to do so exposes it as a vehicle for political opportunism rather than a genuine instrument for liberating the Oromo people.

IV. The Contradiction Within the Alliance's Logic

The alliance's stated objective is to remove the current regime—which is itself a product of past systems of Oromo oppression. If the alliance succeeds in dismantling the current order, does that not constitute a form of accountability?

Advocacy for Oromia answers unequivocally: removal without acknowledgment and redress is insufficient. True liberation requires not merely a change of personnel but a reckoning with the structural foundations of Oromo subjugation. The alliance's failure to commit to such a reckoning renders its objectives inadequate for the Oromo struggle.

V. Conclusion

Advocacy for Oromia articulates a coherent Oromo nationalist position: any political alliance that does not explicitly centre Oromo historical suffering and commit to its redress cannot be trusted.

The critique is strongest in its insistence on historical specificity—generic calls for "survival" and "democracy" can obscure rather than address ethnic-specific oppression. However, the statement is weakest in its lack of concrete evidence for the "political games" charge and in its implicit rejection of broad-based coalition politics.

The underlying question remains unresolved: can Oromo liberation be achieved through alliance with other Ethiopian peoples, or does it require a separate, Oromo-cantered path? Advocacy for Oromia clearly leans toward the latter, but does not fully grapple with the strategic costs of that position.

Therefore, Advocacy for Oromia formally rejects the "Ethiopian Peoples' Forces Alliance for Survival" as an unsuitable vehicle for the liberation and advancement of the Oromo people.

Advocacy for Oromia

21 September: 2026