

1970 EDUARDO MONDLANE MEMORIAL LECTURE

National Liberation and Culture

by

Amilcar Cabral

Secretary General

Partido Africana do Independencia da Guiné e Cabo Verde
(PAIGC)

Translated from the French by Maureen Webster



Delivered at Syracuse University
under the auspices of

The Program of Eastern African Studies
of the
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

February 20, 1970

THE EDUARDO MONDLANE MEMORIAL LECTURES

Shortly after Dr. Eduardo Mondlane was assassinated in Dar es Salaam on February 3, 1969, the Program of Eastern African Studies of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University established a memorial endowment to support an annual distinguished lecture in his memory. In a sense, Dr. Mondlane's academic home became Syracuse University, where he taught after receiving his doctorate in sociology from Northwestern University and working for the United Nations Secretariat. He subsequently returned to Africa with his wife and family to organize FRELIMO, the Mozambique Liberation Front.

The Mondlane Lectureship is conceived as a series that seeks to embody Dr. Mondlane's rare combination of keen intellectual insight, political commitment, and warm humanism. While future Mondlane Memorial Lecturers may quite appropriately be leaders of change from other continents than Africa, it was felt that no one could better inaugurate the Lectures than Amilcar Cabral.

AMILCAR CABRAL

Amilcar Cabral is Secretary-General of the Partido Africana da Independencia da Guiné e Caba Verde (PAIGC). Trained as an agronomist, Mr. Cabral returned from study in Portugal to his home in Bissau, Guinea's major city. From 1952 to 1954 Cabral visited every corner of his country, preparing an agricultural census for the colonial administration and in the process acquiring a detailed knowledge of his own people and their situation. Based on an analysis of the social structure of different groups in Guinea, PAIGC's patient work of clandestine political organization began in 1959. Since 1962, the movement has waged an increasingly successful struggle against the colonial regime. The importance of this campaign to the revolutionary movement in Africa is out of all proportion to Guinea's physical size, roughly that of Switzerland. Basil Davidson's record of the development of the PAIGC in The Liberation of Guiné (Penguin 1969) and Gérard Chaliand's Armed Struggle in Africa (Monthly Review Press 1969) testify to the success of the struggle. A small volume of Mr. Cabral's writings and speeches, Revolution in Guinea, will be published in September 1970 by the Monthly Review Press.

PREFACE

It is a great honor to participate in this ceremony to pay homage to our companion in struggle and a worthy son of Africa, the mourned Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, former President of FRELIMO, assassinated in cowardly fashion by Portuguese colonialists and their allies on February 3, 1969, in Dar es Salaam.

We want to thank Syracuse University and particularly the Program of Eastern African Studies, directed by the scholar and teacher, Marshall Segall, for this initiative. It demonstrates not only the respect and admiration you have for the unforgettable personality of Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, but also your solidarity with the heroic struggle of the Mozambican people and of all African peoples for national liberation and progress.

In accepting your invitation -- which is considered as addressed to our people and to our fighters -- we wanted once more to demonstrate our militant friendship and solidarity for the people of Mozambique and their beloved leader, Dr. Eduardo Mondlane, with whom we have been linked by fraternal bonds in the common struggle against the particularly retrograde Portuguese colonialism. Our friendship and our solidarity are all the more sincere in that we have not always agreed with our comrade Eduardo Mondlane, whose death was also a loss for our people.

Other speakers have had the opportunity to sketch the life of Dr. Eduardo Mondlane and to offer well-merited praise. We want quite simply to reaffirm our admiration for the African patriot and eminent man of culture that he was. We also wish to say that the great merit of Eduardo Mondlane did not lie in his decision to struggle for the freedom of his people. His principal merit lay in being able to merge himself with the reality of his country, to identify with his people and to acculturate himself through the struggle which he directed with courage, determination and wisdom.

Eduardo Chivambo Mondlane, African of rural background, son of peasants and a tribal chief, child educated by missionaries, black pupil of the white schools of colonial Mozambique, university student in racist South Africa, young protégé of an American foundation, fellowship holder at an American university, Ph.D. from Northwestern University, high official in the United Nations, Professor at Syracuse University, President of the Mozambique Liberation Front, fallen in combat for the freedom of his people.

The life of Eduardo Mondlane is, indeed, singularly rich in experience. If one considers the short period when he was a trainee-worker in an agricultural enterprise, we can say that his life cycle includes, practically, all the categories of African colonial society: from the peasantry to the assimilated "petite bourgeoisie," and, on the cultural plane, from the village universe to a universal culture open to the world -- its problems, its contradictions and prospects for evolution.

The important thing is that, after this long journey, Eduardo Mondlane was able to effect his return to the village, as a freedom fighter, and to stimulate the progress of his people, enriched by experiences (and how profound

they were!) in the world today. Thus he gave a potent example: facing all the difficulties, fleeing the temptations, freeing himself from compromises of action or compromises of conscience from cultural (hence political) alienation, he was able to confront his own roots, to identify with his people and to devote himself to the cause of their national and social liberation. That is why the colonialist-imperialists did not forgive him.

That is why, instead of limiting ourselves to the more or less important problems of the common struggle against Portuguese colonialism, we will center our lecture on an essential problem: the dependent and reciprocal relationships between the struggle for national liberation and culture.

If we succeed in convincing the fighters for African liberation and all those who are interested in the liberty and progress of African peoples of the decisive importance of this problem in the process of the struggle, we will have rendered significant homage to Eduardo Mondlane.

Amilcar Cabral
February 20, 1970

AHS

NATIONAL LIBERATION AND CULTURE

by Amílcar Cabral

When Goebbels, the brain behind Nazi propaganda, heard culture being discussed, he brought out his revolver. That shows that the Nazis -- who were and are the most tragic expression of imperialism and of its thirst for domination -- even if they were all degenerates like Hitler, had a clear idea of the value of culture as a factor of resistance to foreign domination.

History teaches us that, in certain circumstances, it is very easy for the foreigner to impose his domination on a people. But it also teaches us that, whatever may be the material aspects of this domination, it can be maintained only by the permanent, organized repression of the cultural life of the people concerned. Implantation of foreign domination can be assured definitively only by physical liquidation of a significant part of the dominated population.

In fact, to take up arms to dominate a people is, above all, to take up arms to destroy, or at least to neutralize, to paralyze, its cultural life. For, as long as there continues to exist a part of these people retaining their own cultural life, foreign domination cannot be sure of its perpetuation. At any moment, depending on internal and external factors determining the evolution of the society in question, cultural resistance (indestructible) may take on new forms (political, economic, armed) in order fully to contest foreign domination.

The ideal for foreign domination, whether imperialist or not, would be to choose

- either to liquidate practically all the population of the dominated country, thereby eliminating the possibilities for cultural resistance;
- or to succeed in imposing itself without damage to the culture of the dominated people -- that is, to harmonize economic and political domination of these people with their cultural personality.

The first hypothesis implies genocide of the indigenous population and creates a void which empties foreign domination of its content and its object: the dominated people. The second hypothesis has not, until now, been confirmed by history. The broad experience of mankind allows us to postulate that it has no practical viability: it is not possible to harmonize the economic and political domination of a people, whatever may be the degree of their social development, with the preservation of their cultural personality.

In order to escape this choice -- which may be called the dilemma of cultural resistance -- imperialist colonial domination has tried to create theories which, in fact, are only gross formulations of racism, and which, in practice, are translated into a permanent state of siege of the indigenous populations on the basis of racist dictatorship (or democracy).

This, for example, is the case with the so-called theory of progressive assimilation of native populations, which turns out to be only a more or less violent attempt to deny the culture of the people in question. The utter

failure of this "theory", implemented in practice by several colonial powers, including Portugal, is the most obvious proof of its lack of viability, if not of its inhuman character. It attains the highest degree of absurdity in the Portuguese case, where Salazar affirmed that Africa does not exist.

This is also the case with the so-called theory of apartheid, created, applied and developed on the basis of the economic and political domination of the people of Southern Africa by a racist minority, with all the outrageous crimes against humanity which that involves. The practice of apartheid takes the form of unrestrained exploitation of the labor force of the African masses, incarcerated and repressed in the largest concentration camp mankind has ever known.

These practical examples give a measure of the drama of foreign imperialist domination as it confronts the cultural reality of the dominated people. They also suggest the strong, dependent and reciprocal relationships existing between the cultural situation and the economic (and political) situation in the behavior of human societies. In fact, culture is always in the life of a society (open or closed) the more or less conscious result of the economic and political activities of that society, the more or less dynamic expression of the kinds of relationships which prevail in that society, on the one hand between man (considered individually or collectively) and nature, and, on the other hand, among individuals, groups of individuals, social strata or classes.

The value of culture as an element of resistance to foreign domination lies in the fact that culture is the vigorous manifestation on the ideological or idealist plane of the physical and historical reality of the society that is dominated or to be dominated. Culture is simultaneously the fruit of a people's history and a determinant of history, by the positive or negative influence which it exerts on the evolution of relationships between man and his environment, among men or groups of men within a society, as well as among different societies. Ignorance of this fact may explain the failure of several attempts at foreign domination -- as well as the failure of some national liberation movements.

Let us examine the nature of national liberation. We shall consider this historical phenomenon in its contemporary context, that is, national liberation in opposition to imperialist domination. The latter is, as we know, distinct both in form and in content from preceding types of foreign domination (tribal, military-aristocratic, feudal, and capitalist domination in the free competition era).

The principal characteristic, common to every kind of imperialist domination, is the negation of the historical process of the dominated people by means of violently usurping the free operation of the process of development of the productive forces. Now, in any given society, the level of development of the productive forces and the system for social utilization of these forces (the ownership system) determine the mode of production. In our opinion, the mode of production whose contradictions are manifested with more or less intensity through the class struggle, is the principal factor in the history of any human group, the level of the productive forces being the true and permanent driving power of history.

For every society, for every group of people, considered as an evolving entity, the level of the productive forces indicates the stage of development of the society and of each of its components in relation to nature, its capacity to act or to react consciously in relation to nature. It indicates and conditions the type of material relationships (expressed objectively or subjectively) which exists between man and his environment. The mode of production which represents, in every phase of history, the result of the unceasing search for a dynamic equilibrium between the level of the productive forces and the system of social utilization of these forces, indicates the stage of development of any given society and of each of its components in relation to itself and in relation to history. It also indicates and conditions the type of material relationships (expressed objectively or subjectively) which exists among the various elements or groups constituting the society in question. Relationships and types of relationships between man and nature, between man and his environment. Relationships and types of relationships among the individual or collective components of a society. To speak of these is to speak of history, but it is also to speak of culture.

Whatever may be the ideological or idealistic characteristics of cultural expression, culture is an essential element of the history of a people. Culture is, perhaps, the product of this history just as the flower is the product of a plant. Like history, or because it is history, culture has as its material base the level of the productive forces and the mode of production. Culture plunges its roots into the physical reality of the environmental humus in which it develops, and it reflects the organic nature of the society, which may be more or less influenced by external factors. History allows us to know the nature and extent of the imbalances and conflicts (economic, political and social) which characterize the evolution of a society; culture allows us to know the dynamic syntheses which have been developed and established by social conscience to resolve these conflicts at each stage of its evolution, in the search for survival and progress.

Just as happens with the flower in a plant, in culture there lies the capacity (or the responsibility) for forming and fertilizing the seedling which will assure the continuity of history, at the same time assuring the prospects for evolution and progress of the society in question. Thus it is understood that imperialist domination, by denying the historical development of the dominated people, necessarily also denies their cultural development. It is also understood why imperialist domination, like all other foreign domination, for its own security, requires cultural oppression and the attempt at direct or indirect liquidation of the essential elements of the culture of the dominated people.

The study of the history of national liberation struggles shows that generally these struggles are preceded by an increase in expressions of culture, consolidated progressively into a successful or unsuccessful attempt to affirm the cultural personality of the dominated people, as a means of negating the oppressor culture. Whatever may be the conditions of a people's subjection to foreign domination, and whatever may be the influence of economic, political and social factors in practicing this domination, it is generally within the culture that we find the seed of opposition, which leads to the structuring and development of the liberation movement.

In our opinion, the foundation for national liberation rests in the inalienable right of every people to have their own history, whatever formulations may be adopted at the level of international law. The objective of national liberation is, therefore, to reclaim the right, usurped by imperialist domination, namely: the liberation of the process of development of national productive forces. Therefore, national liberation takes place when, and only when, national productive forces are completely free of all kinds of foreign domination. The liberation of productive forces and consequently of the ability to determine the mode of production most appropriate to the evolution of the liberated people, necessarily opens up new prospects for the cultural development of the society in question, by returning to that society all its capacity to create progress.

A people who free themselves from foreign domination will be free culturally only if, without complexes and without underestimating the importance of positive accretions from the oppressor and other cultures, they return to the upward paths of their own culture, which is nourished by the living reality of its environment, and which negates both harmful influences and any kind of subjection to foreign cultures. Thus, it may be seen that if imperialist domination has the vital need to practice cultural oppression, national liberation is necessarily an act of culture.

On the basis of what has just been said, we may consider the national liberation movement as the organized political expression of the culture of the people who are undertaking the struggle. For this reason, those who lead the movement must have a clear idea of the value of the culture in the framework of the struggle and must have a thorough knowledge of the people's culture, whatever may be their level of economic development.

In our time it is common to affirm that all peoples have a culture. The time is past when, in an effort to perpetuate the domination of peoples, culture was considered an attribute of privileged peoples or nations, and when, out of either ignorance or malice, culture was confused with technical power, if not with skin color or the shape of one's eyes. The liberation movement, as representative and defender of the culture of the people, must be conscious of the fact that, whatever may be the material conditions of the society it represents, the society is the bearer and creator of culture. The liberation movement must furthermore embody the mass character, the popular character of the culture -- which is not and never could be the privilege of one or of some sectors of the society.

In the thorough analysis of social structure which every liberation movement should be capable of making in relation to the imperatives of the struggle, the cultural characteristics of each group in society have a place of prime importance. For, while the culture has a mass character, it is not uniform, it is not equally developed in all sectors of society. The attitude of each social group toward the liberation struggle is dictated by its economic interests, but it is also influenced profoundly by its culture. It may even be admitted that these differences in cultural levels explain differences in behavior toward the liberation movement on the part of individuals who belong to the same socio-economic group. It is at this point that culture reaches its full significance for each individual: understanding and integration into his environment, identification with fundamental problems and aspirations of the society, acceptance of the possibility of change in the direction of progress.

In the specific conditions of our country -- and we would say, of Africa -- the horizontal and vertical distribution of levels of culture is somewhat complex. In fact, from villages to towns, from one ethnic group to another, from one age group to another, from the peasant to the workman or to the indigenous intellectual who is more or less assimilated, and, as we have said, even from individual to individual within the same social group, the quantitative and qualitative level of culture varies significantly. It is of prime importance for the liberation movement to take these facts into consideration.

In societies with a horizontal social structure, such as the Balante, for example, the distribution of cultural levels is more or less uniform, variations being linked uniquely to characteristics of individuals or of age groups. On the other hand, in societies with a vertical structure, such as the Fula, there are important variations from the top to the bottom of the social pyramid. These differences in social structure illustrate once more the close relationship between culture and economy, and also explain differences in the general or sectoral behavior of these two ethnic groups in relation to the liberation movement.

It is true that the multiplicity of social and ethnic groups complicates the effort to determine the role of culture in the liberation movement. But it is vital not to lose sight of the decisive importance of the class character of the culture in the development of the liberation struggle, even when class structure is or appears to be in embryonic stages of development.

The experience of colonial domination shows that, in the effort to perpetuate exploitation, the colonizer not only creates a system to repress the cultural life of the colonized people; he also provokes and develops the cultural alienation of a part of the population, either by so-called assimilation of indigenous people, or by creating a social gap between the indigenous elites and the popular masses. As a result of this process of dividing or of deepening the divisions in the society, it happens that a considerable part of the population, notably the urban or peasant "petite bourgeoisie", assimilates the colonizer's mentality, considers itself culturally superior to its own people and ignores or looks down upon their cultural values. This situation, characteristic of the majority of colonized intellectuals, is consolidated by increases in the social privileges of the assimilated or alienated group with direct implications for the behavior of individuals in this group in relation to the liberation movement. A reconversion of minds -- of mental sets -- is thus indispensable to the true integration of people into the liberation movement. Such reconversion -- re-Africanization, in our case -- may take place before the struggle, but it is completed only during the course of the struggle, through daily contact with the popular masses in the communion of sacrifice required by the struggle.

However, we must take into account the fact that, faced with the prospect of political independence, the ambition and the opportunism from which the liberation movement generally suffers may bring into the struggle unconverted individuals. The latter, on the basis of their level of schooling, their scientific or technical knowledge, but without losing any of their social class biases, may attain the highest positions in the liberation movement. Vigilance is thus indispensable on the cultural as well as the political plane. For, in the liberation movement as elsewhere, all that glitters is not necessarily gold: political leaders -- even the most famous -- may be culturally alienated people.

But the social class characteristics of the culture are even more discernible in the behavior of privileged groups in rural areas, especially in the case of ethnic groups with a vertical social structure, where, nevertheless, assimilation or cultural alienation influences are non-existent or practically non-existent. This is the case, for example, with the Fula ruling class. Under colonial domination, the political authority of this class (traditional chiefs, noble families, religious leaders) is purely nominal, and the popular masses know that true authority lies with and is acted upon by colonial administrators. However, the ruling class preserves in essence its basic cultural authority over the masses and this has very important political implications.

Recognizing this reality, the colonizer who represses or inhibits significant cultural activity on the part of the masses at the base of the social pyramid, strengthens and protects the prestige and the cultural influence of the ruling class at the summit. The colonizer installs chiefs who support him and who are to some degree accepted by the masses; he gives these chiefs material privileges such as education for their eldest children, creates chiefdoms where they did not exist before, develops cordial relations with religious leaders, builds mosques, organizes journeys to Mecca, etc. And, above all, by means of the repressive organs of colonial administration, he guarantees economic and social privileges to the ruling class in their relations with the masses. All this does not make it impossible that, among these ruling classes, there may be individuals or groups of individuals who join the liberation movement, although less frequently than in the case of the assimilated "petite bourgeoisie". Several traditional and religious leaders join the struggle at the very beginning or during its development, making an enthusiastic contribution to the cause of liberation. But here again vigilance is indispensable: preserving deep down the cultural prejudices of their class, individuals in this category generally see in the liberation movement the only valid means, using the sacrifices of the masses, to eliminate colonial oppression of their own class and to re-establish in this way their complete political and cultural domination of the people.

In the general framework of contesting colonial imperialist domination and in the actual situation to which we refer, among the oppressor's most loyal allies are found some high officials and intellectuals of the liberal professions, assimilated people, and also a significant number of representatives of the ruling class from rural areas. This fact gives some measure of the influence (positive or negative) of culture and cultural prejudices in the problem of political choice when one is confronted with the liberation movement. It also illustrates the limits of this influence and the supremacy of the class factor in the behavior of the different social groups. The high official or the assimilated intellectual, characterized by total cultural alienation, identifies himself by political choice with the traditional or religious leader who has experienced no significant foreign cultural influences. For these two categories of people place above all principles or demands of a cultural nature -- and against the aspirations of the people -- their own economic and social privileges, their own class interests. That is a truth which the liberation movement cannot afford to ignore without risking betrayal of the economic, political, social, and cultural objectives of the struggle.

Without minimizing the positive contribution which privileged classes may bring to the struggle, the liberation movement must, on the cultural level just as on the political level, base its action in popular culture, whatever

may be the diversity of levels of cultures in the country. The cultural combat against colonial domination -- the first phase of the liberation movement -- can be planned efficiently only on the basis of the culture of the rural and urban working masses, including the nationalist (revolutionary) "petite bourgeoisie" who have been re-Africanized or who are ready for cultural re-conversion. Whatever may be the complexity of this basic cultural panorama, the liberation movement must be capable of distinguishing within it the essential from the secondary, the positive from the negative, the progressive from the reactionary, in order to characterize the master line which defines progressively a national culture.

In order for culture to play the important role which falls to it in the framework of the liberation movement, the movement must be able to preserve the positive cultural values of every well-defined social group, of every category, and to achieve the confluence of these values in the service of the struggle, giving it a new dimension -- the national dimension. Confronted with such a necessity, the liberation struggle is, above all, a struggle both for the preservation and survival of the cultural values of the people and for the harmonization and development of these values within a national framework.

The political and moral unity of the liberation movement and of the people it represents and directs, implies achieving the cultural unity of the social groups which are of key importance for the liberation struggle. This unity is achieved on the one hand by total identification with the environmental reality and with the fundamental problems and aspirations of the people; and, on the other hand, by progressive cultural identification of the various social groups participating in the struggle. As it progresses the liberation struggle must bring diverse interests into harmony, resolve contradictions and define common objectives in the search for liberty and progress. The taking to heart of its objectives by large strata in the population, reflected in their determination in the face of difficulties and sacrifices, is a great political and moral victory. It is also a cultural achievement of decisive importance for the subsequent development and success of the liberation movement.

The greater the differences between the culture of the dominated people and the culture of their oppressor, the more possible such a victory becomes. History proves that it is much less difficult to dominate and to continue dominating a people whose culture is similar or analogous to that of the conqueror. It could be contended that the failure of Napoleon, whatever may have been the economic and political motivations of his wars of conquest, resulted from his ignorance of this principle, or from his inability to limit his ambition to the domination of peoples whose culture was more or less similar to that of France. The same thing could be said about other ancient, modern, or contemporary empires.

One of the most serious errors, if not the most serious error, committed by colonial powers in Africa, may have been to ignore or under-estimate the cultural strength of African peoples. This attitude is particularly clear in the case of Portuguese colonial domination, which has not been content with denying absolutely the existence of the cultural values of the African and his social position but has persisted in forbidding him all kinds of political activity. The people of Portugal, who have not even enjoyed the