

“*Kätät Awaj*”¹ of Emperor Mənilək and Ḥailä Səlasse to counter the Italian Aggressions: A Comparative Text Analysis

Dechasa Abebe²

Abstract

The main objective of this article is to analyse the differences between the texts of “Kätät Awaj” of Emperor Mənilək and Emperor Ḥailä Səlasse to counter the Italian aggressions and the reasons behind their differences. The text versions used for the analysis were taken from the chronicles of Emperor Mənilək and Ḥailä Səlasse by Gäbrä Səlasse and Gäbrä Wäləd respectively. Two parallel text analysis approaches, rhetorical criticism and content analysis, were employed. Accordingly, differences are observed between the two texts in terms of size, the historical setting in which they were written, way of addressing the peoples, techniques of selecting persuasive matters, declaring methods of providing food supplies, firearms, and ammunitions, confidences or wording tones of the emperors, identifications of a place of mobilizations and stating techniques of marches to the war fronts. The basic reasons behind these differences lie in the nature of the state apparatus and the level of centralization versus decentralisation of the government's political power.

Keywords: Emperor Ḥailä Səlasse, Emperor Mənilək, Italian Aggressions, Peasant army, Text Analysis, “*Kätät Awaj*”s

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ejossah.v18i2.4>

¹ The word “Mobilisation Proclamations” is indicated as the English translation of the Amharic word “*Kätät Awaj*” for the present purpose. Several authors on the matter took different English translations, like “call for war”, “declaration”, “and proclamation” etc. under different contexts for different purposes.

² Centre for African and Asian Studies, College of Social Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Email: dechasa.abebe@aau.edu.et, Tel.: +251911798518, P.O. Box: 1503/ Addis Ababa

Background

Text analysis is used to interpret the content, structure, and functions of messages in a text. Frey, Botan, & Kreps (1999) identified four major approaches to text analysis: rhetorical criticism, content analysis, interaction analysis, and performance studies. Rhetorical criticism is a systematic method for describing, analysing, interpreting, and evaluating the persuasive force of messages embedded in texts. Content analysis is used to identify, enumerate, and analyse occurrences of specific messages and their characteristics in texts. The third approach, interaction analysis, is viewed as a complex accomplishment that requires much knowledge of individual communicators and the ability to coordinate behaviour with others. Finally, performance studies seek to give meaning to a two-way engagement with one another through performance. For the present discussion, rhetorical criticism and content analysis have been employed because of the purpose and nature of the texts. So, the basic objectives of this discussion are: to explain the differences between the persuasive forces of the two "*Kätät Awaj*"s, to compare and contrast the rhetoric of the two emperors mentioned above, and to analyse the nature of interactions between the monarchs and the army. Ethiopian emperors produced the texts selected for this analysis as "*Kätät Awaj*"s.

In the earlier history of Ethiopia, the Emperor was a political leader as well as the commander-in-chief of the "national army"³ who mobilised troops under different provincial governors. In the Ethiopian tradition, the Emperor would not send his army to the war front and remain behind in his palace. That was probably why several Ethiopian emperors lost their lives in different battlefields in the long history of Ethiopia. Such unfortunate incidents happened in both mediaeval and recent history. The chronicles of Ethiopian emperors are frequented by explanations about such incidents, depicting the victims as martyrs for their religion, creating some parallel with biblical stories. Emperor Gälawodewos (c.1540-1559) of mediaeval Ethiopia and Emperor Tewodros II (r. 1855-1868), and Emperor Yohannəs IV (1872-1889) are examples of such experiences in Ethiopian history (Täklä Şadəq, 1966 E.C⁴, pp. 801, 817; Rubenson, 1991, p. 269;

³ The army was mobilised from different provinces of the country and added to the emperor's army during times of external invasion or internal wars. Provincial armies were under the command of their respective masters.

⁴ The E.C. stands for the Ethiopian Calendar used here for the Amharic literature because of the fact that it is not possible to convert it to the Gregorian calendar unless the month of publication is indicated. The Ethiopian Calendar is eight years behind the Gregorian from

Zewde, 1975, p. 42). Thus, the Ethiopian emperors had a crucial role in war declarations and in commanding troops at the war fronts. Mobilising techniques are so dramatic: *Nägarit* (royal drum) would be beaten while the “*Kätät Awaj*”s are avowed. A “*Kätät Awaj*” could be orally announced or read from a paper or parchment. The nature of the “*Kätät Awaj*”s varied from time to time depending on the purposes of the war: offensive or defensive, religious, economic, political power, territorial, and the like. Most of the “*Kätät Awaj*”s had religious, political, patriotic, and in a few cases, economic motives (Mellot, 2016, pp. 61-89). Most of the wars against foreign powers in Ethiopian history were defensive. In fact, civil wars were fought among Ethiopians for political power and territory (Rubenson, 1991, pp. 288-399).

By and large, under imperial rule, loyalty of soldiers was to the Emperor or other immediate masters rather than to the country. The army was decentralised and under the command of different provincial and local governors. The chant and zeal of the soldiers were not often to die for the motherland but for their beloved masters (Rubenson, 1991). Behind all the detailed differences between the two “*Kätät Awaj*”s discussed below, a basic difference exists between the two emperors. The government of Emperor Mənilək was characterised by “quasi federalism”⁵, able to collect only annual tributes and taxes from regions that were governed by their traditional hereditary rulers (Merera, 2003). The Emperor was not expected to enter into detailed internal affairs regarding their respective provinces. They had numerous armies that could be mobilised by their own calls and orders once the general direction was given from the centre. So, the mobilisation “*Kätät Awaj*” of Mənilək was made in line with this government structure. In contrast, the government of Emperor Hailä Səlasse was in the process of dissolving the political and military powers of hereditary rulers of the provinces and replacing them with his personal appointees who were from very humble backgrounds. In fact, he had accomplished most of those missions by 1935 (Bahru, 2008, pp. 96-120). Accordingly, he centralised the very political and military powers of the state. As a result, the “*Kätät Awaj*” contained detailed descriptions and explanations without leaving room for autonomous internal decisions and

the months of January to the beginning of September and seven years behind from the months of September to the end of December.

⁵ In the context of limited resources and rudimentary institutional tools, Emperor Menilek tended to follow the long cherished tradition of governing a vast country by providing provincial/ local autonomy. In contrast, Emperor Hailä Səlasse sought to depart from that tradition.

orders (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, pp. 16-19). Moreover, there were differences in terms of modern transportation and communications during the two periods under discussion. There were almost no modern means of transportation and communications for Mənilək's government, while Hailä Səlasse's government was able to use some modern means of transportation and communications. Thus, the differences that prevailed between the two "*Kätät Awaj*"s under discussion here were manifested because of a number of things including the differences in the government structures and also the use of means of transport and communication.

For this analysis, the texts have been taken from the documents (sources) assumed to be original, complete, and accurate. Specifically the chronicle by Gäbrä Səlasse Wälädä Arägay (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225) for the "*Kätät Awaj*" of Mənilək in 1895 and the chronicle by Gäbrä Wäläd Ingəda Wärəq (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, pp. 16-19) for the "*Kätät Awaj*" of Emperor Hailä Səlasse in 1935 were used for the entire analysis. Of course, in the latter case, cross-checking was made with the Emperor's memoir *My life and the Progress of Ethiopia* (Hailä Səlasse, 1965 E.C, pp. 192-195). These two chronicles were written by individuals who were the actual participants in the incidents. The chronicle of the first emperor covered the period to 1909. It is said that the original of this document was duplicated, stamped by the chronicler himself, and donated to the palace and different monasteries in the country. One of the copies in the palace was given to a French man Mir Moris de' Cope, in 1921/22 by Empress Zäwditu. He translated the copy into French and published it in 1930. The Amharic version was not published because the empress planned to do it herself. Unfortunately, she died before realising the publication. On top of this, the Italians invaded the country almost after a decade. As a result, all the original copies of the document were lost. The present version at our disposal, which was published in 1959 E.C. is said to be a second copy of the original version counterchecked with the French translation. Thus, the text used for this discussion was taken from this publication (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, pp. 8-11).

The author of the second document, Gäbrä Wäläd Ingəda Wärəq, went with the Emperor's regiment to the northern front and recorded the day-to-day experiences of the Ethiopian forces. His document covered the span of the first five months of the invasion (from November 30, 1935 to May 3, 1936). Both dates are landmarks in the chronology of the war. The first was the date of the Emperor's departure to the northern front, and the second referred to the Emperor's departure to England. So, the text for the present discussion is the introductory part of the document. Fortunately enough, this document was kept from destruction during the occupation probably because the author became loyal to the invaders and spent

the occupation years safely in Addis Ababa (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 EC, pp. 15-19). His document was even published ten years earlier (1949 E.C) than the former.

Quotations available in different publications regarding the first text vary from time to time and from purpose to purpose, although claiming that they are the original texts of the “*Kätät Awaj*”. One example, in this case, is the differences between the texts of the chronicle by Gäbrä Səlasse and that of a quotation by Mahətamä Səlasse (Mahətamä Səlasse, 1962 E.C, p. 254) on the call of Mənilək. It can be observed from the table below.

No.	Gäbrä Səlasse’s Text	Mahətamä Səlasse’s Text
1	አኖረኝ (..... permitted me to live)	አኖረን (.....permitted us to live)
2	እኔም እስከ አሁን በእግዚአብሔር ቸርነት ገዛሁ (I remain until now in my throne through the grace of God.)	እኔም እስከ አሁን ገዛሁ (I am also ruling up until now.)
3 ብሞትም ሞት የሁሉ ነውና (... I have no fear of death; since death is there for all.) ሞት የሁሉ ነውና (.. I do not fear to die for my country Ethiopia, since death is for all.)
4	ደግሞ እግዚአብሔር አሳፍሮኝ አያውቅም። (...also God has never let me down.)	እግዚአብሔር እስከ አሁን በጠላቴ ፊት አሳፍሮኝ አያውቅም። (... till now God has never let me down in front of my enemies.)
5	... ጠላት መጥቷል። (...the enemy has come.)	... ጠላት መጥቶብናል። (...the enemy has come against us.)
6	እኔም ያገሬን ከብት ማለቅ የሰውን መድከም አይቼ አስከአሁን ዝም ብለው ደግሞ እያለፈ እንደፍልፍል መሬት ይቆፍር ጀመር። (... I remained quiet up until now, because the livestock were	bypassed

Dechasa Abebe

decimated, the people were exhausted. But again these enemies advanced digging in the ground like moles.)

7 Nothing is mentioned about provision. ስንቅህን እያሰናዳህ ተከተለኝ። (prepare your provision and follow me.)

8 አሁን ግን በእግዚአብሔር ረዳትነት አገሬን አሳልፌ አልሰጠውም። (... but now with God's help, I will not surrender my country to them.) Bypassed

9 ያገሬ ሰው ከአሁን ቀደም የበደልሁህ አይመስለኝም። (... My fellow countrymen, I do not believe that I disappointed you in the past.....) ያገሬ የኢትዮጵያ ሕዝብ ሆይ እስከ አሁን የበደልሁህ በደል ያለ አይመስለኝም። (... my fellow Ethiopian people I do not believe that I disappointed you in the past. ...)

10 አንተም እስከ አሁን አላስቀየምኸኝም። (you have not also disappointed me.) Bypassed

11 ጉልበት ያለህ በጉልበትህ እርዳኝ ጉልበትም የሌለህ ለልጅህ ለምሽትህ ለሃይማኖትህ ስትል በጎዘን እርዳኝ። (those who are fit, lend me your strong arm, let the weak help me by your prayer for the sake of your children, your wives, and your religion.) ስለዚህ ለሀገርህ ለሚስትህ ለልጅህ ለሃይማኖትህ ስትል ጉልበት ያለህ በጉልበትህ ጎዘብ ያለህ በጎዘብህ ጉልበትም ጎዘብም የሌለህ ግን በሐዘንህ እርዳኝ። (for the sake of your country, wives, children and religion; those who are fit, lend me your strong arm, those who are economically capable support me with your property, let the weak

help me by your prayer .)

12	<p>ወስልተህ የቀረህ ግን ኋላ ትጣላኛለህ አልተውህም ማርያምን ለዚህ አማላጅ የለኝም ። (For those who seek lame excuse to not come; I will be upset and will not have mercy on you. As St. Mary is my witness!)</p>	<p>ይህን አዋጅ ከሰማህ በኋላ ወስልተህ ከዘመቻው ብትቀር ትቀጣለህ። (those who seek lame excuse and do not join the campaign, you will be punished.)</p>
13	<p>ዘመቻዬም በጥቅምት ነውና የሸዋ ሰው እስከ ጥቅምት እኩሌታ ድረስ ወረይሉ ከተህ ላግኝህ። (my campaign begins in October, and expect volunteers from Šäwa to gather in Wäräilu by the mid of October.)</p>	<p>እኔም በጥቅምት ወር ከአዲስ አበባ እንሳለሁና የሸዋ ሰው እስከ ጥቅምት እኩሌታ ወረይሉ ይግባ። (I also leave Addis Ababa for Wäräilu in October, volunteers from Šäwa should arrive there by the mid of October.)</p>

Table 1: Contrast between the texts of Gäbrä Səlasse and Mahətamä Səlasse on Mənilək’s “*Kətät Awaj*”

As quoted in the table above, significant differences exist between the two texts on the same “*Kətät Awaj*” in their wordings and phrases. The major possible reason behind the modification of Mənilək’s “*Kətät Awaj*” text by Mahətamä Səlasse while quoting for his purpose is the differences in nature of the administration and state ideology, particularly the level of centralisation and decentralisation of political power between Mənilək and Hailä Səlasse. The latter was characterised by more centralisation. In the table above (row number one), the pronoun “I” was probably converted to “we” to present Hailä Səlasse’s government as more inclusive. In row number two in the original by the chronicler, there is a phrase “with the help of God” but Mahətamä Səlasse left it out, probably to present the government. In row number three, Mahətamä Səlasse added the readiness of the Emperor to die for his country, but this was not available in the chronicle. In the row number 5, the chronicler stated the coming as arrival, but Mahtämä Səlasse emphasised the coming as “against us”. It is also surprising that Mahətamä Səlasse bypassed without mentioning the basic reason or critical problem that delayed the reaction of Emperor Mənilək against the gradual Italian

intrusion into the interior of Ethiopian territory in row number six of the table. Contrary to that, he added the sentence which is not available in the chronicle, “prepare your provision and follow me!” in row number seven of the table above. Mahētämä Səlasse also bypassed the oath and chant of Emperor Mənilək, who said that he would not surrender his country but was ready to defend it with the help of God. In row number eleven, the issue of money (property) was not mentioned in the chronicle.

Size of the texts

The first significant difference between the texts of the two “*Kətät Awaj*”s is their size. Emperor Mənilək’s “*Kətät Awaj*” was very brief, less than a page, about one hundred or so words (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225), whereas that of Emperor Hailä Səlasse’s was about three pages, more than six hundred and fifty words (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, pp. 16-19). The “*Kətät Awaj*”s were put on paper by the respective chroniclers of the two emperors. Gäbrä Səlasse wrote the first one, the second one was written by Haile Wäldä Rufe (Mahētämä Səlasse, p. 277). The central message of both “*Kətät Awaj*”s was almost similar. But there were differences. Mənilək’s “*Kətät Awaj*” gave more focus to military issues than Hailä Səlasse’s. The latter’s declaration contained more political rhetoric than military edicts as a result the size of Hailä Səlasse’s “*Kətät Awaj*” was larger than the former. It can be observed from the texts that within those 40 years between the first and the second Italian aggression, the politico-military rhetoric of the Ethiopian government was significantly changed from more military to political (Bahru, 1984, pp. 1-29).

In this regard, documents produced or books written about the battle of Adwa during the reign of Emperor Hailä Səlasse attempted to give the image of the period to the call and campaign to the battle. While quoting from the text of the “*Kətät Awaj*” of Mənilək, they made it larger than the original one (Mahētämä Səlasse, 1962 E.C, p. 254). Words and phrases like “Ethiopia”, “my country,” and the like were added to the original. Similarly, some pronouns like “I” were converted to “we” and “my” was converted to “our” in those quotations, probably to make the national issue more inclusive rather than exclusively the business of the monarch. Those who were quoting from the original went to the extent of using the Amharic style of their own time rather than putting the style of Mənilək’s time, although they put it in inverted commas (Mahētämä Səlasse, 1962 E.C, p. 254). It seems that the authors of the period of Hailä Səlasse attempted to give special attention to the context instead of the text. Moreover, Hailä Səlasse’s “*Kətät Awaj*” incorporated marginal, sometimes repeated words and phrases in the text

that contributed to the enlargement of the size of the text. For instance, the phrase “ጭጭራ ታለቃሀ ሌሌ ተጌታሀ”, “subjects with your leader, servants with your master” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 17) is something obvious and done for centuries. So, it might be taken for granted that every member of his followers would know it in the case of Mənilək. But that of Hailä Səlasse was more of bureaucrats and peasants who did not fight any significant battle for long in comparison to that of Mənilək except for the battles of Sägäle in 1916 and that of Ančəm in 1930 (Bahru, 2000, pp. 120, 137).

Setting the background

In the contemporary political history of Ethiopia, it is common to put a historical background of the country by glorifying the historical deeds of the predecessors in such “*Kätät Awaj*”s as “አባቶቻችን ደማቸውን አፍስሰው አጥንታቸውን ከስክሰው ያቆዩንን ሀገር” (Mänəgəsətu, 2004 E.C, p. 5). To mean, “Our forefathers were shedding their blood and breaking their bones to save the country for us” However, Mənilək’s “*Kätät Awaj*” did not contain such historical phrases; rather, it began by stating the Emperor’s achievements “አገር አስፍቶ ጠላት አጥፍቶ” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225); “enlarged my country, destroyed my enemy.” In contrast, Hailä Səlasse’s “*Kätät Awaj*” began by stating the country’s history of independence for about 3000 years in spite of numerous foreign attempts to deprive its independence. The text, moreover, stated that Italy was attempting to occupy this country of very old history and tradition; “ሽማግሌዎን አገራችንን...” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E. C, p. 17). The “*Kätät Awaj*” also mentioned the glorious victory of Adwa that according to the text happened with the help of God. More surprisingly; the text not only skipped mentioning the contribution of the brave fighters of the country for the victory but also missed to mention Mənilək and the role he played in the victory (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E. C, p. 17). The territorial extent or the international boundaries of the country was mentioned in one form or another in the texts of both “*Kätät Awaj*”s. In the case of Mənilək, it was stated Ethiopia did not pick a fight over territories lost earlier to the Italians “ባሄደው አገራችን ጠብ አልፈለግንም ነበር” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 16). Hailä Səlasse “*Kätät Awaj*” claimed that the international boundary of Ethiopia was the sea by saying the Italians invaded the country “crossing the sea demarcated for us by God” “እግዚአብሔር የወሰነልንን ባህር አልፎ” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225). Mənilək said that he expanded his country’s territory to the maximum. Of course, contrary to this, he claimed vast territories as far as Khartoum and Nyasaland in his correspondence letter to European governments to defy or nullify the Wächale

treaty (Work, 1935, pp. 100-134). On the other hand, Ḥailä Səlasse's "*Kätät Awaj*" claimed that the Italians took a number of Ethiopian historical territories that the Ethiopians did not fight for, simply to maintain peace (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 16). In fact, implicitly, it looks that he accused Emperor Mənilək for his failure to secure all the Ethiopian territories. He underlined that those lost Ethiopian territories were used by the Italians to launch their invasion of the country (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 16).

Addressed subjects

The term "Ethiopia" and "Ethiopians" were never mentioned in the original text of the "*Kätät Awaj*" of Emperor Mənilək. But, it was mentioned more than seven times in that of Emperor Ḥailä Səlasse (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C.: 16-19). Of course, others who claimed that they quoted from the original text of the "*Kätät Awaj*" of Emperor Mənilək added terms like "Ethiopia", "my country", "we", "our" even if they were not available in the original text (Mahətamä Səlasse, 1962 E.C, p. 254). It was addressed that the people of Šäwa were to congregate at Wäräilu in the month of October. The other regions north of Šäwa were addressed differently. For instance, those north of Checheho (Gondär) were ordered to assemble themselves at Ašange, and the others very proximate to Təgray (like Wäləqait, Šägäde,) were told to assemble themselves at Mäqälle (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225). The provinces that had experienced confrontations and battles with Mənilək were not directly addressed in the original text of the "*Kätät Awaj*". Let alone those regions south of Šäwa, Wällo, which had persistent conflicts and battles with Mənilək was not directly addressed. Of course, loyal governors were called from all provinces in the Emperor's domain since he implemented a form of decentralised government in which the provincial rulers had their own armies. Wällo's case can be seen in this sense. After a number of conflicts with the army of Emperor Yohannəs IV and that of Mənilək II, Mohammed Ali (*Ras Mika'el*) became the sole loyal vassal from among traditional rival rulers of Wällo (Bahru, 2000, pp. 46-47). The southern regions were also governed by Šäwan appointees who had numerous armies of their own. So, they were expected to mobilise their army and campaign to the war front (Bahru, 2000, pp. 76-77).

Some traditional rulers of the southern provinces were also in Šäwa during this campaign either as prisoners or campaigners. They went to Wäräilu, accompanying the Emperor. However, they were told to return back to Šäwa from Wäräilu by order of the Emperor as; “ከዚያም ላይ የጅማን ሹም አባ ጅፋርን፣ የሌቃን ሹም ደጃች ገብረ እግዚአብሔርን፣ የሻንቅላንና የዓረብን ሹም ደጃች ጅቴን፣ የወላምውን

ሹም ካዎ ጦናን ሂዱ አገሬን ጠብቁ ብለው መልሰው ሰደዱቸው።” (Gäbrä Sēlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 231); “after this, he ordered the appointee of Ğamma Abba Ğəfar, the appointee of Leqa *Dājach* Gäbrä Igəziabher, the appointee of Šankəla and Arab *Dājach* Jote, the appointee of Wälamo Kawo Ṭona saying ‘go and safeguard my country’ and sent them back.” Regarding this issue, there were rumours among scholars that they were ordered to go back to Šäwa, fearing that they would collaborate or surrender to the Italians (Gäda Mälba, 1985, pp. 70-93). In fact, it may not be as Gäbrä Sēlasse claimed that they were the Emperor’s appointees at this time. Rather, they were apparently prisoners and under the custody of the governor of the prison of Ankobär *Wähniazaž* Wäldä Šadəq Gošu as well as *Ras* Darge who was the regent of the Emperor by this time to defend Šäwa from the possible attacks of the southern regions mainly from the Oromo who were the dominant inhabitants of Šäwa surrounding the court of Mənilək (Mänəgəsətu, 1959 E.C, p. 145). The other strange description of Gäbrä Sēlasse is how he addressed these traditional governors, even kings, for their own respective regions. He identified them as if they were the personal appointee (ሹም) of the Emperor (Gäbrä Sēlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 231). Of course, they accepted or acknowledged the suzerainty of Emperor Mənilək.

The provinces which Emperor Mənilək directly addressed in the “*Kətät Awaj*” were assumed to be his government's strong supporters or power bases. Incidentally, they also became strong centres of “patriotic resistance” during the Italian invasion of 1936-41, while the other southern provinces became collaborators and supporters of the Italians in relative terms. This was probably because of their ethnic, religious or other differences and discontent with the government of Hailä Sēlasse as well as their loose attachment to Ethiopianess (Tädəla, 2004 E.C.). In contrast to such exclusive call of Mənilək, that of Hailä Sēlasse was apparently inclusive and addressed the peoples of Ethiopia in every corner of the country, including those who had discontent with the Emperor or his government. He asserted that they needed to campaign for their country and the glory of their national flag and the monarch (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 16-19).

Parallel to this, the call of Mənilək was made for every able subject probably in those provinces directly addressed. Failure to respond to the call would result in harsh punishment; “ወስልተህ የቀረህ ግን ኋላ ትጣላኛለህ አልተውህም፣ ማርያምን ለዚህ አማላጅ የለኝም።” (Gäbrä Sēlasse, 1959 EC, p. 225). It is unclear what punishment would be expected as it said “I will not have mercy” on this issue. But that of Hailä Sēlasse was a bit elaborative and addressed the concerned participants, the army and the *balabats* (landlords) or *mälkäñas* (warlords). He made it in the form of a

call for a vassalage system or አለቃና ምንዝር, particularly for the army. The *balagär* and the *nägade* (the peasants and the merchants) were addressed separately for a different responsibility. They were expected to fill gaps in case their contribution is needed, particularly by means of their guns. Similarly, aged *balabats* and *mälkäñas* were ordered that in case they could not actually partake in the war front, they were told to send their able sons. Failure to respond to the call would result in a punishment stated in black and white unlike that of Mənilək's

“ከእኛ ለግዳላ” ማለት ወንጌት ማዘጋጀት የሚችል ግንኙነት ስላለው አይደለም ለደብዳቤው በርስትህና በገንዘብ በአካልም ትቀጣለህ!” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 18); “those of you who will not join the campaign after you are ordered, will be caught by the appointee of the locality or by an accuser and would be punished by depriving your property as well as by corporal punishment”.

The other related issue in the texts of the “*Kätät Awaj*”s that is worth contrasting is how the possible collaborators with the enemy will be punished or treated. Even if he did not initially order it as such, Emperor Mənilək put death punishment on all those who defied their country and collaborated with the Italians. However, in the case of Ḥailä Səlasse’s “*Kätät Awaj*”, the matter was clearly stated in the text as “አዋጅ ከተነገረ በኋላ የወንበዴነት ሥራ ስትሰራ ለጠላት ስንቅም ነገርም ስታቀብል የተገኘህ ርስትህንና ገንዘብህን ትወረሳለህ፤ ያለምህረትም በሞት ፍርድ ትቀጣለህ።” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 19); “those of you who would commit the act of spying by providing the enemy with provisions and information, will be punished, your land and property will be confiscated and you will be put to death without mercy.” The other inclusive nature of Emperor Ḥailä Səlasse’s “*Kätät Awaj*” was the one in which subjects identified as criminals were also called for the war. Ḥailä Səlasse declared that “ከአሁን ቀደም ነፍስ ገድለህ ባለደምህን ፈርተህ ወንበዴም ሆነህ ቤት አቃጥለህ የሰው ገንዘብ ቀምተህ ሸሽተህ በዱር በገደል የምትኖር ምሬሃለሁና በጥቅምት 5 ቀን በየሻለቃህ ግባ።” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 19); “those of you who committed murder, burned houses/properties, plundered properties and retreated to the jungle and living there, I give you mercy, join your local governor or regiment up to the 5th of *Təkəmət* [for the campaign].”

An apparent attempt of Ḥailä Səlasse to dwarf the achievement of Mənilək by underscoring the condition of the lost territories can also be one point of analysis. The people were repeatedly told in his “*Kätät Awaj*” as if those under Emperor Ḥailä Səlasse’s rule were enjoying good governance; “...በወሰደው አገራችን ላይ ያሉት ወንድሞቻችን የተሸከሙትን የባርነት ቀንበር አይንህ የሚያየው ዣሮህ

የሚሰማው ነው።... እነሱ ላይ በሚሰራው ግፍ ስናዝን.....” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 16); “you are seeing by your naked eyes and hearing by your ears about the yoke of slavery imposed on your brothers who are living on the territories the Italians took.... While we are feeling sorry because of the atrocities done on them....”

Persuasive reasons

The purposes of the campaign were told to the public not in identical ways. It could be expected that the government called the people for the campaign so that they defend their motherland from foreign aggression, saying that this was for their own freedom. However, there were no such expressions in Mənilək’s “*Kätät Awaj*”. Such national issues do not seem to persuade the wider public. As to the tradition of the day, what persuaded them to respond to the call were issues directly related to their personal lives, like their children, wives, and religion were more persuasive or made them emotional (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225). They considered those who came against themselves and their families as their enemies. Their *rəst* (hereditary plot of land) and wives were main issues used for the mobilisation. The traditional saying “በሚስትና በርስት” is to mean a peasant has no hesitation in fighting against anyone who came after his land and wife. Therefore, for ordinary people who constituted the majority of the mobilised soldiers, the wider national issues like independence, boundaries and political power were marginal. They also had a strong attachment, not with the nation or the country but rather with their immediate master “ለጌታዬ....”; “For my lord...”, “የጠጄ ጌታ!” “Lord of my mead!”, “የጭማዬ ጌታ.....”, “Lord of my delicious meat!” Among such societies, religion was also taken as a guarantee for eternal life which was assumed to be the one that liberated them from the servitude of this temporal world. That was why Mənilək declared that “...ለልጅህ፣ ለምሽትህ፣ ለሃይማኖትህ ስትል....” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225); “for the sake of your children, wife, religion....” The enemy is coming to make you lose all these, it means.

However, “*Kätät Awaj*” of Hailä Səlasse were characterised by more nationalist sentiments or issues such as the nation, the monarchy, the flag, and elements that symbolise national unity and independence. Accordingly, this “*Kätät Awaj*” to counter the Italian aggression was made for all the people of the nation, all the people of Ethiopia. That is why his “*Kätät Awaj*” did not mention provinces or personal life; rather, it mentioned issues like independence, monarchy, and flag as “ለነጻነትህ፣ ለንጉሠ ነገሥትህ እና ለባንዲራህ ስትል. ” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 17); “for your independence, king of kings and national flag.” The issue of religion was mentioned in both cases. Religious issues could not be overlooked for

mobilisation purposes, even during the reign of Emperor Hailä Sälasse. In fact, the same Emperor who made such a relatively modern “*Kätät Awaj*” was forced to declare in a way that addressed those regional differences, feudal and peasantry societies. This happened when some of the provinces could not be mobilised under that national umbrella. They could not take Ethiopian or national issues as theirs. They took their personal disappointment with Hailä Sälasse as disappointment with the nation. One such incident took place in Goğğam. That is why the “*Kätät Awaj*” to the people of Goğğam resorted back to the type of “*Kätät Awaj*” made to peasant societies; the children, wives, and religion became the central theme; “ከርስትህ የሚነቅል፣ ሚስትህንና ሴት ልጅህን በኃይል እየወሰደ የሚያረከስ፣ ኦርቶዶክሳዊት ሃይማኖትህን የሚለውጥ...” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 19); “one, who will evict you from your land, will take by force and defile your wife and daughters, convert your Orthodox religion...” Of course, that does not mean there were no exceptions. It seems that the difference between the nation and the monarch was not clearly understood among Ethiopian societies of the time. Any disappointment with the monarch was taken as disappointment with the nation. In fact, nationalism or loyalty to one’s nation is a product of mass literacy and movement to abolish the thought of a divine right to the monarch as well as the prevalence of the major inputs to accomplish those missions (Anderson, 1991). However, during the period under discussion in Ethiopia, the monarchs claimed divine right, even to the extent of equating Ethiopia with the monarch, because of the absence of those necessary preconditions (Täklä Hawaryat, 2006, pp. 400-412). That was clearly observed in the “*Kätät Awaj*” of Emperor Mäniläk, who understood that a possible disappointment of the public by his record would undermine his call for mobilisation. He mentioned that as “ያገሬ ሰው ከአሁን ቀደም የበደልሁህ አይመስለኝም፣ አንተም እስከአሁን አላሰቀየምኸኝም...” (Gäbrä Sälasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225); “(...men of my country I don’t think I have abused you [your right] before now, you also never offended me up to now.” If that was the case he knew that they would not follow or support him for the war which was fully national interest but considered as the Emperor’s personal business rather than national business. But, Hailä Sälasse tried to make it a national issue than monarch’s personal issue as much as possible. The phrases in the “*Kätät Awaj*” like “ላገርህ ለኢትዮጵያ ሞት ብትነፍጋት.... If you deprive your death for your country, Ethiopia.... ወደፊት የሚቆይህን ታሪክህን እያሰብህ...thinking a history awaiting you for the future....” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 17) are clear indications. It is simply to say that citizens should be ready to die for their nation or country, Ethiopia. He underlined that they are making history; they will be well remembered by the next generation

for their sacrifice to defend their country. All these were not mentioned in Mənilək's "*Kətät Awaj*".

Provisions, firearms and ammunitions

Clear order was not made in the "*Kətät Awaj*" of Mənilək regarding the provisions. As seen from the chronicle, everyone was expected to prepare his provisions to a certain extent. However, it was the tradition of the time that they were provided by the peasants on their route to the battlefield. The people have commonly said that Mənilək declared as "ስንቅህን በአሁያ አመልክን በጉያ..."; "load your provisions on donkey's back and put your habit in your lap" although the phrase was not available in the "*Kətät Awaj*" published in the chronicle. The army was ordered to be mobilised in a hurry so that they could arrive before the peasants on the route to harvest their crops; "... አሁሉ በደጅ ሳለ እንድረስ ::" (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959, p. 226); "... he said let us arrive while the crop is in the field..." In contrast to this, plunder were boldly prohibited by Hailä Səlasse. Of course, the army might overlook the prohibition of the Emperor, and plunder the peasants' properties on their route to the war front. In this case, as a rule, the government was expected to supply provisions in different forms for the army. The "better of" members of the society tended to prepare their relatively high-quality provisions. Hailä Səlasse declared that it is prohibited to plunder the property of the peasants except for animal fodders, firewood and *kubät* (dried dung). He underlined that the army should not disappoint the peasants (*balagär*) so that they could support the army or be ready to die with the army for the same purpose; "ስትጓዝም ከሳር፣ ከገለባና ከኩባት በቀር...." (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 17); "while travelling, except fodder and firewood..." As one can see, this is the direct contrast to the act of Mənilək "አዝመራው በደጅ ሳለ::"; "while the crop is in the field". Moreover, in the case of Hailä Səlasse's "*Kətät Awaj*", the peasants were ordered to take different provisions to marketplaces so that the army could buy them at fair prices. So, at least officially, the army was expected to purchase its provisions, not plunder the peasants in the latter case; "በየመንገዱ ላይ ያለህ ባላገር ለኢትዮጵያ ነጻነት የሚዘምተው ወታደር እንዳይቸገር አገረገዥህ በሚነግርህ ቀን በሚሰፍርበት ቦታ እየወጣህ ገቢያ አቁምለት::" (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, pp. 17-18); "those peasants on the route of the army, [you need to] find a market on the date fixed by the local governor so that the army to the war front for Ethiopia's independence will not be in problem." The order was probably made here because most of the directions were expected from the centre during the reign of Hailä Səlasse. But under Mənilək those detailed administrative issues or other related problems tended to be addressed by the

traditional governors of the respective region. So, for Mənilək, it was enough to give only a general direction, and then the provincial rulers should mobilise the army and their provisions. Moreover, the relationship between the Emperor and the peasants of each region seems relatively loose. But such arrangements were dissolved during the period of Emperor Hailä Səlasse, and his personal appointees who had not their own army and traditional attachments with the people were not expected to mobilise the army by themselves (Bahru, 2000). For instance, they were not in a position to serve (*gabər*) or a feast for the people. They were officially salaried appointees of the Emperor. But previously, the traditional rulers who had an attachment with the people in one form or another could serve that. Unfortunately, most of them were dislocated, mostly called to the centre under different pretexts or already defeated and imprisoned under the custody of the Emperor. There was a threat that these dislocated or imprisoned regional lords would collaborate with the Italians by mobilising the people against the Emperor in particular or the state in general. Hailä Səlasse, who was well aware of that, tried to be in peaceful relation with the peasants, unlike his predecessors who in one way or another tried to delight the army at the expense of the peasants (Täklä Iyäsus, 2002 EC). Contrary to the above, let alone forcing the peasants to feed the army on its march, Haile Selassie promised them to pay for their labour they exerted to transport the provisions from the government store to military stations. He declared as “ባገፋም ያለህ ነጋዴና ባላገር ካህንም ብትሆን ኪራዩን እከፍልሃለሁና ካሥራቱ እህል ላይ እየጫንክ ክተት እተባለበት ቦታ ድረስ ወስደህ አግባልኝ።” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 18); “all the peasants and merchants even the priests in each country [locality], take the tithe crops and submit to the station of the army, I will pay you the rent for that.”

The other issue worth to be explained as a difference between the two “*Kätät Awaj*”s was the supply of firearms and ammunition. Mənilək’s “*Kätät Awaj*” did not mention about weapons in the “*Kätät Awaj*”, in contrast Hailä Səlasse’s “*Kätät Awaj*” said that the Italians were proud of and confident in their modern firearms. There was a significant difference in the amount of the possession of firearms between the two emperors vis-a-vis Italy during the two wars. Mənilək was not as far behind the Italians in possessing firearms. He purchased most of the firearms and ammunition using his excellent diplomatic relations with the Europeans before his denunciation of the Wächale Treaty (Chapple, 1998, pp. 47-63). He also had another comparative advantage: Italy itself was not able to produce most of the modern firearms it had during the second aggression. Her level of technological development was minimal. However, Hailä Səlasse did not have the comparative advantages mentioned above for two reasons.

Primarily, Ethiopia was deterred in one form or another from purchasing firearms or denied the right to have access to the seas by the Europeans. Secondly, Italy had been preparing itself for revenge for about four decades since its defeat at the battle of Adwa. The then Italian government tried to be perfect in all aspects of its preparation so that it could defeat the Ethiopians (Mänägəsətu & Mäzəgäbu, 1986 E.C, pp. 47-71). As a result, the difference in possession of firearms and other related supplies between Ethiopia and Italy can be mentioned as polar apart. That was why Hailä Səlasse added a phrase in his call for the war as “...በብልጽግና በጉልበቱ ተመክቶ... ኢጣልያ ምንም በመሳሪያው ቢከራ...” (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 16); “... confident in its technology and [military] force.....although it is proud of its firearms....”

Moreover, the peasant army was expected to purchase its own weapons and ammunition in the case of the first one. But in the case of the second that had the character of a modern state, the government needed to provide all the provisions, firearms, and ammunition. Of course, Mənilək himself attempted to provide firearms and ammunition for his best dignitaries in one form or another. In the modern state, at least in theory, the government provided its army with all supplies in kind or cash. That was why the peasants were advised (ordered) to establish markets on the route of the army to the war front. Similarly, Emperor Hailä Səlasse asserted that “ጠመንዥ ያለህ ጥይትና ስንቅህን ጠመንዥም የሌለህ ጠመንዥ ና ጥይት ስንቅህንም ዳርጌሃለሁና አገረ ገዥህን ተከትለህ እንድትዘምት...” (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 18); “ for those of you who have guns I will provide you bullets and provisions, for those of you who have no guns I will provide you with guns and bullets and provisions! Accompany your local governors to the war front.” Such an issue was never mentioned in that Emperor Mənilək’s “*Kätät Awaj*”.

Confidence

The other area of difference in the “*Kätät Awaj*”s was the emperors' confidence and the tone in their wordings. Mənilək was relatively confident in his wording. It looks like he was sure he could defeat the Italians with God's help as he defeated his other enemies who had previously confronted him. He is ready to die but has confidence in God that he will be victorious; “እስከ ዛሬ አሳፍሮኝ አያውቅም፣ ዛሬም ያሳፍረኛል ብዬ አልጠረጥርም” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225) “God never let me down till today, and I do not hesitate that He will let me down today”. He underlined that he did not rush to the confrontation until that moment because of the animal diseases and famines that ravaged his country. But, the Italians took the situation as if he feared them. He asserted that they should know that he is ready to

confront them and defend his territory. He declared that he could not sit and see while the enemy took away his territory. Throughout all the words, phrases, and sentences, one could observe a strong confidence in the Emperor that he would be victorious; of course, the phrase “by the help of God” was there almost always, either implicitly or explicitly.

Unlike Mənilək’s trust only in God, Hailä Səlasse had additionally developed confidence in the League of Nations, in which Ethiopia was also a member, according to the text of the “*Kätät Awaj*”. He took the case from the very beginning to that League and waited for its decision or mediation (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 16). However, after that process ended in failure or could not stop the Italians from their aggression, he called his people for confrontations. The wording of the call was not as military as that of Mənilək. As mentioned, his “*Kätät Awaj*” was more political and emphasised that dying for one’s motherland and monarch is a pride. He did not assure the army for victory, unlike Mənilək, who said, “አልጠረጥርም!” “I do not hesitate!” rather said “ለመጠቃት በመታሰባችን እጅግ አዝኛለሁ” (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 17). “I am so sorry that we are thought to be attacked”. One can clearly observe the tone between these two expressions. By the way, dying for their respective purposes was underlined in both cases. But the difference is that Emperor Mənilək claimed that he was ready to die for his country, probably before anyone. He declared his would-be death as one of the deaths of one’s country. But Hailä Səlasse, declared it as special or peculiar to others’ death. It looks like it is common for other citizens to die for their country, but that of the monarch and the patriarch or pope is very special. Mənilək did not claim that his death was special but rather as one of the deaths for one’s country, “ሞት የሁሉም ነውና”; “death is for all....” whereas Hailä Səlasse said “እንኳን ሌላው ሰው ንጉሱም ጳጳሱም ቢሞት” (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 19); “Let alone other citizens if the monarch and the pope would die...”

Marches

The emperors declared the marches of their armies to the war front slightly in different ways, as stated in the texts. The differences are seen in the order and actual marches to the place of mobilisation or temporary station of the army in Wällo. Both of the calls were made at the end of the rainy season, in September, to arrive at their respective stations in Wällo in October. Emperor Mənilək ordered that “ዘመቻዬም በጥቅምት ነውና የሸዋ ሰው እስከ ጥቅምት እኩሌታ ድረስ ወራይሉ ከተሀ ላግኝህ” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 225); “... since my campaign will be in *Təkəmat*, all men of Šäwa, I will meet you at Wäräilu by the mid of *Təkəmat*.” The

other regions located north of Šäwa were ordered to assemble themselves at Ašange, and the most northern regions were ordered to assemble themselves at Mäqälle in the same “*Kätät Awaj*”. This clearly meant the Emperor himself would be there by the last week of October (እስከ ጥቅምት እኩሌታ). Accordingly, he started his march in the second week of October 1895 (on *Täkəmət* 2, 1888 EC) and arrived at Wäräilu after 18 days, as stated by the chronicler. In fact, he was delayed by five days from the deadline for arrival that he put for his army. It was from Wäräilu that his chief military commanders with their army were ordered to proceed to the war front as “ኢጣልያው የሚቀላችሁ የሆነ እንደሆነው ጉት፣ የሚከብዳችሁ እንደሆነግን ወደኔ ላኩብኝ ብለው አስቀድመው ሰደዱ ችው።” (Gäbrä Səlasse, 1959 E.C, p. 231); “in case the Italian force will be easy for you, attack it, if it will be difficult for you, inform me.” By the way, Wäräilu was an important transitional administrative town between Šäwa and Wällo for Mənilək. He spent more time here for his politico-military business even before he became king of kings.

Coming to the “*Kätät Awaj*” of Hailä Səlasse, although the aggression was on two fronts, his call was not for the two fronts. The “*Kätät Awaj*” does not have such clear order for the southern. Front. What is available in the “*Kätät Awaj*” was only his call to the northern front that was made as “አንሳስህም ጭፍራ ታለቃህ ሎሌ ተጌታህ ሳትለይ በጥቅም ት 12 ቀን ለሚከኤል ደሴ ላይ ክተት።” (Gäbrä Wäləd, 2000 E.C, p. 17); “start your march without separating between the followers with their leader and the servants with their master and arrive at Däse on the 12th of *Täkəmət*, on the date of Mika’el”. Regarding the date of arrival in Wällo, it was almost the same week as that of the order of Mənilək. Here, the difference lies in their place of mobilisation. Instead of using the southernmost town of Wällo, Hailä Səlasse ordered his army to assemble at Däse, the town and strong base for the descendent of *Nəgus* Mika’el, the maternal grandfather of the Emperor’s wife, Mänän.

The march of Mənilək’s army was totally on foot, horse, and mule back. That of Hailä Səlasse was at least at the royal level by vehicle. So, Emperor Hailä Səlasse delivered a special order on the matter, probably expecting that disorganisation may happen because of that difference in the means of transportation, “ጭ ፍራ ታለቃህ ሎሌ ተጌታህ”. In fact, it could be primarily because of the fact that such detailed orders could be left to regional lords and governors who were expected to mobilise their own army in the case of Emperor Mənilək. The other possible reason for such special order was that the army and followers of Emperor Mənilək, in general, were still at war and practising it daily. So, there was no need to tell them such detailed routines for their marches. But of Hailä Səlasse

army was composed of bureaucrats, technocrats, and peasants who did not fight significant battles for long in comparison to that Mənilək, who made persistent marches and fought numerous battles almost in the entire southern half of the country throughout the second half of the nineteenth century under the banner of territorial incorporation. Moreover, they were in a similar practice in Wällo under the pretext of opening the route to Gondär and Təgray for Šäwa as well as to bring the traditional governors of Wällo under the vassalage of Mənilək throughout the last quarter of the 19th century. However, army commanders under Hailä Səlasse did not experience persistent marches and battles. They fought only the battles of Sägäle in 1916 and that of Ančem in 1930 (Bahru, 1991, pp. 120, 137).

The royal marches between Šäwa and Wällo took about 18 days for Mənilək and only two days for Hailä Səlasse. Mənilək ordered his army to arrive there by the 15th of *Təkəmət*, and he arrived there by the 20th of *Təkəmət*. But the armies of Emperor Hailä Səlasse were told to be at Däse by the 12th of *Təkəmət*, and the Emperor arrived there on 20th of *Hədar* even if he was travelling by vehicle. Hailä Səlasse was delayed from the army for 38 days on. Of course, unlike during the reign of Mənilək, the Emperor was expected to command the “national army” in his capital town or from a town located at a reasonable distance from a possible accidental attack by the enemy. So, it seems that the intention of Hailä Səlasse was not to be at the actual war front. Mənilək was at Wäräilu only for a few days and immediately proceeded to the war front even if it took him months to arrive. But Emperor Hailä Səlasse was at Däse until the middle of *Yəkətit*. Of course, it is said that Emperor Hailä Səlasse was to give proper commandments or orders for both fronts stationed at the appropriate place for that purpose. In fact, he was at Maychäw, a place that gave its name for the northern campaign against the Italians in March 1935/36, where the Italians defeated him. That happened after the Italians defeated the Ethiopian army in different battles. Of course, the army of Mənilək also fought the battles at the end of February, and the last one was fought on the first of March.

To conclude, in the case of Mənilək, it was understood that it is normal and natural for an emperor to command his army and march to the war front; “ወረደሉ ከተህ ላግኝህ..” indicating that we will get there or I will also be there by that time “ላግኝህ”. But in the case of Hailä Səlasse, there was somewhat a different understanding that an emperor would give an order to his army while being in his palace; “ደሴ ላይ ከተት...” is an indication of sending the army to the war front. There was no sign that he would be there by that time. In this case, the period of Hailä Səlasse was stretched between the modern and the traditional. It is said that

his dignitaries advised him that he should be in his office or well-protected central location and give commandments instead of being at the war front. However, Hailä Səlasse thought that he should not be dwarfed by the history of his predecessors, mainly that of Mənilək who achieved a glorious victory of Adwa being physically at the war front with his wife, Taitu. Of course, there was no intention or attempt from the side of Mänän to be at the war front, although Hailä Səlasse made all the necessary effort not to be dwarfed by the achievement of Mənilək. One may expect that Mänän tried to repeat some of the deeds of Taitu. But she was not even at Däse while her 12 years old son, heir to the throne, was said to be with his father up to Däse, leaving his mother in the capital. So, Hailä Səlasse was also insisting that he should be at the war front. Of course, he did not say at any condition and moment to achieve a glorious victory but frequently said to die for his country; “የኢትዮጵያ ነጻነት ካልቆመ የኔም ሕይወት እንዲቆም ስለማልፈልግ..... መሞት የተሻለ ነው ።” (Gäbrä Wäläd, 2000 E.C, p. 30); “I do not want to live while my country is fallen in the hands of the enemy.better for me to die.”

Conclusions

The texts of the “*Kätät Awaj*”s are the manifestations of the state ideology in several aspects; like centralisation versus decentralisation of political power. Each word, phrase, and sentence was carefully chosen to indicate that ideology. All the themes identified as findings in this discussion are the areas where the differences between the two texts and the reasons behind them reside. The texts clearly illustrate the nature of the state structure and political power of the government, the state apparatus's progress level, and the relationship between the state and citizens (subjects). Moreover, the texts boldly identify the body responsible for declaring war and the bodies responsible for organising and financing wars in those reigns. Finally, one can understand that the forty years between the two invasions were the duration of significant transformations in the Ethiopian state and society. For instance, in the processes of mobilising resources and manpower for the war of defence that transformed from provinces based to centre based. Besides that, the rank and file of the manpower for the war in the case of the first were men of battles where as that of the second were men of relatively peaceful office tenure. Ethiopia was portrayed as a nation in the text of the second “*Kätät Awaj*” which was not in the case of the first. Of course, no clear demarcation was made between the nation (state) and the monarch who was identified as an icon of national unity.

References

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Re-elections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (Rev. ed.). Verso.
- Bahru Zewde. (1984). Economic origins of the absolutist state in Ethiopia (1916-1935). *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 17(1), 1-29.
- Bahru Zewde. (2000). *A history of modern Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa University Press.
- Bahru Zewde. (2008). *Society, state and history: Selected essays*. Addis Ababa University press.
- Chapple, D. (1998). The firearms of Adwa. In Abdussamad H. Ahmed & Pankhrust, R. (Eds.), *ADWA: Victory Centenary Conference, 26 February- 2 March 1996* (pp.47- 63). Addis Ababa University Institute of Ethiopian Studies.
- Frey, L., Botan, C., & Kreps, G. (1999). *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods* (2nd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Gäbrä Səlasse. (1959 E.C). *Tarikä Zämänä zä Dagmawi Mənilək Nəgusä Nəgäst zä Itəyopəya*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing house.
- Gäbrä Wäləd Inəgəda Wärq.(2000 E.C). *Maychäw: Yä Maychäw zämächana yäguzo tarik*. Addis Ababa University Press.
- Gäda Mälba. (1985). *Oromiya: Yä Oromo həzəb tarik*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing Press.
- Ḥailä Səlasse. (1965). *Həywotena yä Itəyopəya Irməja*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing house.
- Mahətämä Səlasse Wäldä Mäsqäl. (1962 E.C). *Zəkərä Nəgər*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing house.
- Mellot, Noal (tran.).(2016). Sound and power in the Christian realm of Ethiopia (Seventeenth- eighteenth centuries). *International Journal of Ethiopian and Eritrean Studies*, 19(1), 61-89.
- Mänəgəsətu Ḥailä Marəyam.(2004 E.C).*Təgəlačən: Yä Itəyopəya həzəb abəyotawi yä təgəl tarik*. Tshehai publishers.
- Mänəgəsətu ḤailäMarəyam & Mäzəgäbu Mətəkä (tran.). (1986 E.C).*Tərs yägäbačagär: Itəyopəya*. Commercial Printing Agency.
- Mänəgəsətu Lämma. (1959 E.C). *Mäšəhafä Təzəta zä aläqa Lämma*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing Press.
- Merera Gudina. (2003). *Ethiopia: Competing Ethinc Nationalisms and the Quest for Democracy, 1960-200*. Chamber Printing House.
- Rubenson, S. (1991). *Survival of Ethiopian Independence*. Kuraz Publishing Agency.

Tädəla ZäYohannəs. (2004 E.C). *Yä Itəyopəya tarik: Italiya bä Itəyopəya kä Wälwäl iskä Gondär, Gənbət 1927- Hədar 1934 EC*. Mankusa printing press.

Täklä Hawaryat Täklä Mariyam. (1998 E.C). *Autobiography (Yä Həwote tarik)*. Addis Ababa University Press.

Täklä Şadəq Mäkuriya. (1966 E.C). *Yä Gərañ Ahmäd Wärära*. Bərhanəna Sälām Printing house.

Täklä İyäsus Waqğəra. (2002 E.C). *YäItəyopəya tarik*. Bərhanəna Sälām.

Work, E. (1935). *Ethiopia, A pawn in European diplomacy*. New Concord.

Zewde Gäbrä-Selassie. (1975). *Yohannəs IV of Ethiopia: A political biography*. Clarendon Press.