

AMILCAR CABRAL'S NOTES ON THE IMPASSES TO AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT

Godwyns Ade' Agbude, PhD

College of Development Studies, School of Social Sciences,
Department of Political Science and International Relations Covenant
University, Ogun State, Nigeria

Israel Adoba

Postgraduate Candidate, Faculty of Business, Environment and Society,
Department of International Studies and Social Science,
Coventry University, United Kingdom

Abstract

Development in Africa has been a consistent dialogue since the continent got independence. After the disengagement of the colonialists from the former colonies, development agenda has been set for Africa by both the ex-colonialists and the indigenous political leaders who inherited the colonial state. Amilcar Cabral is one of the theorists who engaged in a critical interrogation of the state of development in Africa. This paper focuses on exhuming two of the factors Cabral considered as impasses to Africa's development. This paper also engages literature on Cabral and the speeches of Cabral where he bore his mind on development imperatives in the liberated zones which are replicas of the contemporary states in Africa. In other words, this paper dwells on secondary data analyzed through textual analysis.

We finally arrive at the two monsters that have been standing as impediments to development in Africa.

Keywords: Development, Underdevelopment, Foreign domination, Colonial State and Political leaders

Introduction

Cabral's discourse on African development is central to current understanding of development in Africa. It is a serious intellectual 'homicide' to constrain Cabral to a mere revolutionary theorist without considering that he considered revolution as just a means to an end which is development. Cabral established in his writings and speeches that revolution was embraced by the PAIGC after Portuguese colonialist determined to

continue its mission of exploiting and pauperizing Guinea and Cape Verde (Cabral, 1973, 1972, 1980; Chabal, 2003). Cabral was also a contemporary of Frantz Fanon who was born in Martinique, educated in Paris and wrote about the Algerian revolution. Both men were men of peace; neither plunged immediately into the troubled waters of revolution without first trying more tranquil currents (Blackey, 1974). Cabral himself wrote that ‘In the beginning, we thought it would be possible to fight in the towns, using the experiences of other countries, but that was a mistake. We tried strikes and demonstrations, but...realized this would not work (Cabral, 1980). It was the violent response of Portuguese colonialism to the strikes and demonstrations that led to the formation of PAIGC which has as parts of its agenda the:

- i. Total elimination of the colonial administrative structure and establishment of a national and democratic structure for the internal administration of the country”
- ii. Planning and harmonious development of the Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde socio-eco political ambiance.
- iii. Establishment of fundamental freedoms, respect for the rights of man and guarantees for the exercise of these freedoms and rights.
- iv. Creation of welfare organizations connected with productive activity.
- v. Development of industry and commerce along modern line. Progressive establishment of state commercial and industrial enterprises. Development of African crafts.
- vi. Budgetary balance. Creation of a new fiscal system. Creation of a national currency, stabilized and free from inflation.
- vii. Total elimination of the complexes created by colonialism, and of the consequences of colonialist culture and exploitation (Cabral, 1969:169-173)

Cabral’s awareness of the impossibility of achieving the above stated objectives (planning the development of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde) due to colonial domination made him devote his life to the liberation of these two Portuguese African colonies through the building of a vanguard party that he guided through a decade of war while constructing an infrastructure of social, economic and political institutions among his people in the liberated areas (Chilcote, 1984).

Methodology

Several speeches given by Cabral before international bodies, Party members, and villagers and personal letters and communiqué sent by him to different bodies during the revolution in Guinea have been codified into books and texts. Therefore, the books, texts, journals and other materials that form the body of scholarly works on Amilcar Lopel Cabral have been used in this study.

The techniques for analyzing these secondary data are textual analysis and explanatory method. Textual analysis implies analyzing the content of books, journal articles, monographs, unpublished theses, research projects and internet materials. Explanatory method implies interpretation of existing texts on a subject matter. It means drawing inferences, premises, conclusions and implications from a scholar's work. This explanatory method is germane to the study of Cabral's theory of development given the importance of interpretation to his work.

Impasses to Development in Cabral's Theory of Development

A critical appraisal of Cabral's political thought, focusing on his ideas of development, reveals certain fundamental forces Cabral construed as impasses to the liberation struggle. It must be noted that Cabral used the concepts of the struggle or national liberation struggle to refer to the fight for independence and the building of the new state. In *Return to the Source*, Cabral argued that "our fortune is that we are creating the state through the struggle" (Cabral, 1973: 85). This implies that the struggle was not just to oust the colonialists without building a viable society for personal and collective development of all the citizens and the society at large. Cabral envisioned a society void of exploitation of man by man, and a society that gives room for human development as its primary focus. He did not give a cogent definition of development since he was more interested in pragmatic development ideology than mere theoretical pontification that has no positive impact on the lives of the people. It is on the basis of this, I think it is safe to proceed to his discourse on impasses to development in Africa.

Foreign domination: Colonialism, Neocolonialism and Imperialism

For Cabral, the immediate source of underdevelopment is foreign domination as explicated in colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism. It is at this juncture that Cabral's conception of development and underdevelopment begins to run towards the theory of dependency. Cabral coherently posits that the imperialist countries of the Western hemisphere were always involved in matters in the developing countries where they were sure they would benefit. Though Cabral broke up with Marxism in its conception of class struggle as the motive force of world history, but his view of development and underdevelopment aligns with Marxist and neo-Marxist "dependency" or "underdevelopment" theories. For Cabral, the imperialist countries would only come to the aid of any country where the possibility of exploitation exists. For instance, Cabral referred to Portuguese colonialism as retrograde forces; meaning the forces of retrogression, backwardness, deterioration and regression. Foreign domination will lead to underdevelopment.

We shall avoid re-echoing McCulloch (1983) who had done a good justice to Cabral's theory of imperialism. My focus shall be how to show the similarity between under development and foreign domination in Cabral's concept of development. Cabral defined imperialism as "the worldwide expression of the profit motive and the ever-increasing accumulation of surplus values by monopoly financial capital, in two regions of the world: first in Europe and, later, in North America" (Cabral, 1980:127). From this definition, Cabral's aversion for imperialism as a repressive profit seeking enterprise whose domain of operation is in the developing countries becomes obvious. Cabral argued that "imperialism is a piracy transplanted from the seas to dry land, piracy reorganized, consolidated and adapted to the aim of plundering the natural and human resources of our people" (Cabral, 1980: 127). From the foregoing, neither the people nor their country would ever develop with the presence of the imperialists, whose major target or goal is the plundering of the people's means of development and using such for their own development. Thus, Cabral consistently canvassed for the elimination of foreign domination in any form in order to stimulate national development in the African colonies.

In his words:

...the people of Guinea are determined to bring about an improvement in the situation of their country. They are resolved to live up to their tradition of resistance to foreign domination by putting a speedy end to Portuguese colonialism and laying down in freedom the groundwork for the progressive development of their African homeland (Cabral, 1972: 34).

The determination to bring about an improvement in the situation of their country could not be realized in the face of foreign domination. The pauperization of the people and their society was as a result of imperialistic domination of all the sphere of life in Guinea. Therefore, in order to develop, foreign domination must end. The uniqueness of Cabral's argument against foreign domination is that he accommodated imperialism and neocolonialism within the purview of his theory even though the colonial war was still ongoing. He had argued that Portugal could not afford imperialism and neocolonialism and yet went on to theorize on the two phenomena. He saw the international character of imperialism and neocolonialism as the re-enforcement of socio eco-political disintegration of a growing national economy. This rather shows that Cabral was providing solution that would lead to a crack in the wall of underdevelopment in Africa. From the above quote, for Cabral, foreign domination is one of the impasses to the progressive development of their African homeland. On the basis of this

quest for freedom and development, Cabral and the PAIGC's revolutionary struggle against foreign domination is justified.

Furthermore, Cabral classified both colonialism and neocolonialism under imperialism. According to him, there are two forms of imperialism:

Direct domination – by means of a political power made up of agents foreign to the dominated people (armed forces, police, administrative agents and settlers – which is conventionally called *classical colonialism or colonialism*.

Indirect domination – by means of a political power made up mainly or completely of native agents – which is conventionally called *neocolonialism*

...the impact of imperialism on the historical process of the dominated people is paralysis, stagnation (even in some cases, regression) in that process (Cabral, 1980: 128).

Imperialism, whether in the form of colonialism or neocolonialism, results in backwardness, stagnation and underdevelopment. Therefore, to terminate underdevelopment, imperialism has to be violently discarded.

In the same vein, Lenin (1933) argued that the failure of Marx's theory of dictatorship of the proletariat (the revolution) in the capitalist states was as a result of shift in exploitation within the capitalist states to the under developing countries. The proletariats in the capitalist countries were relieved as their countries found a new source of cheap labour, cheap raw materials and markets for their finished products. The greedy nature of the bourgeois was redirected to the developing countries as the new ground for exploitation while the indigenous proletariat on the capitalist countries received relief and better welfare compared to the initial gruesome exploitation under capitalism.

Commenting on the impassive attitude of the United States towards the struggle, he posited:

And if the petrol in land had already begun to be exported, perhaps even Standard Oil would be sympathetic to us against the Portuguese. Perhaps, the American government would be sympathetic to us against the Portuguese. Perhaps it would even have the courage to say to the Portuguese: 'Either you stop and give independence to Guine now, or we shall withdraw all our aid to you, and attack you in the United Nations.' And why? Out of their own interests. But as our land has nothing developed, they think of us as a corridor between the Republics of Guinea and Senegal, a simple passageway (Cabral, 1980: 53).

From the above, it is clear that Cabral seemed not to believe that reliance on the imperialist countries can bring a meaningful development to

the developing countries. This is because most of them are driven primarily by selfish interest. The philosophical question could be, is it morally wrong to be preoccupied with self interests first in the international community? In other words, can we sustain the argument that being preoccupied with self interest is morally wrong given that man's greatest instinct is the instinct of self-preservation, and the same is applicable for all nations? But the point that must not escape being emphasized is that no nation has the right to hurt another nation while seeking self-preservation.

According to him, the US continued to aid Portugal against its colonies because the colonies had no natural resources that would have appealed to the greedy character of most of the imperialist States. The absence of the natural resources made them conceive Guine as a mere passageway to other countries that have natural resources. For the imperialist countries, the developing countries are mere tools for the former's economic and national development.

Knowing the negative effect of foreign domination on national development of a country, Cabral warned against the trio – colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism.

In his words:

But let us prepare ourselves too, each day, and be vigilant, so as not to allow a new form of colonialism to be established in our countries, so as not to allow in our countries any form of imperialism, so as not to allow neocolonialism, already a cancerous growth in certain parts of Africa and of the world, to reach our own countries (Cabral, 1972: 85).

Cancerous is the adjective of the noun cancer. Cancerous, as used by Cabral, here implies neocolonialism and imperialism spreading as negative forces, bad phenomena and destructive foreign incentive of underdevelopment. They destroy national development and impose underdevelopment and economic backwardness as necessary categories in the developing nations. Imperialism in the Marxian sense is an outflow of surplus value converted into capital, a process Marx referred to as capital accumulation (Marx, 1984; Marx and Engels, 1958, 1888/1973). This capital accumulation continues, given the expansionary nature of capital resulting into 'spillage' to foreign markets. Capital becomes the means of foreign domination. In another view, colonialism is said to be a product of capitalism which had over developed in the capitalist countries. This gave room for colonialism. The revival for self-government in the colonized countries led to the 'independence' of most of the developing countries. However, upon independence, the ex-colonial masters revisited with bilateral and multilateral financial institutions used in promoting neocolonialism. Nkrumah's thoughts and writings on neo-colonialism confirm the danger of

fraternizing with the ex-colonial masters. In his book, *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, he captured the fundamental dangers of neo-colonialism as one of the inhibitors of development of the developing countries. For him, foreign capital is used for the exploitation of the developing countries and the development of the capitalist (imperialist) countries. Neocolonialism is the worst form of imperialism, therefore, he argued that a State in the grip of neocolonialism is not master of its own destiny. He also argued that neocolonialism is an attempt to export the social conflicts of capitalism of the capitalist countries and he conceives neocolonialism as one of the greatest dangers facing the African States. Neocolonialism works with the instrument of balkanization which is the process of dividing an area or region into smaller and often mutually hostile groups in order to take advantage of them individually (Nkrumah, 1965). The publishing of the book led to the cancellation of \$25 million of the United States' aid to Ghana as a reaction to the provocative analysis of neocolonialism by Nkrumah. Jock McCulloch showed the negative effect of foreign domination on national development thus:

In the case of Guine the effect of imperialism was evident in the paucity of economic development in which all but the most rudimentary industries were absent (McCulloch, 1983: 115).

Imperialism impoverishes any country where it operates. The Guinea experience was such that the most primary or simplistic industry that could generate the development of the indigenous people was never put in place. Cabral, indeed, theorized on imperialism, but it was not just for the sake of theory but to show the poverty of the imperialist's ideology to generate development for the colonized (developing) countries. Cabral argued that Portugal itself was not even an imperialist country because it lacked the necessary features of imperialism given its economic backwardness (Cabral, 1980). Portugal was a middle man between the imperialist countries and its colonies.

Cabral calibrated Portugal's inadequacies as an imperialist country in the following word:

Portugal is an underdeveloped country with 40 per cent illiteracy, and with one of the lowest standards of living in Europe. If she could have a 'civilizing influence' on any people, she would be accomplishing a kind of miracle (Cabral, 1980: 20).

These indices as outlined by Cabral reveal the impossibility of Portugal to pose as an imperialist country. The overall goal of imperialism as a quest for profit maximization overrides its possibility to serve as a tool of development by the developed countries for the developing countries. Its

starting point, according to both Marx and Lenin, is capital accumulation vis-à-vis profit maximization. McCulloch underscored this when he argued that “imperialism is domination by capitalism for the purpose of capital. This is the reality behind the idea of imperialism as a civilizing mission which was used to justify the exploitation of the peoples of Asia and Africa in the name of a higher order. Imperialism has various guises, and its appearance can take the forms of colonialism, neocolonialism, and even semi-colonialism, as was the case in Cuba and in pre-revolutionary China” (McCulloch, 1983: 117). Thus, there is an unbroken tie among the imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism and lastly capitalism. Cabral is just one of the thinkers that saw the interrelatedness of these phenomena in the history of world politics. All of these are always to the disadvantage of the development of the developing countries.

Ake’s argument on the disarticulation of African economy for the benefit of the colonialist and the imperialist countries sums up the damage of colonialism, by extension imperialism on the development of the African societies.

In his words:

The colonial government did not do very much to encourage the development of manufacturing. Their interest in a colony lay primarily in the fact that it was a source of raw materials as well as a market for selling metropolitan manufacturing goods (Ake, 1981: 46).

All the activities of the colonial masters who were the imperialist countries centered more on generating economic development for their countries rather than promoting and developing the economy of their colonies. The colonialists were majorly the imperialist countries.

Ake continues;

...the power of the Royal Niger Company was even greater than its governmental role suggests. The company not only administered part of the British Empire but helped to extend British imperialism by trade and by force of arms. It was the company which compelled the sultans of Sokoto and Gwandu to accept its monopoly of the exploitation of their territories (Ake, 1981: 47).

In the above quote, first, there is a link between colonialism (which itself is related to capitalism) and imperialism which can be described as the employment of the engines of government and diplomacy to acquire territories, protectorates, and/or spheres of influence occupied usually by other races or peoples, and to promoted industrial, trade, and investment opportunities. However, it has shown over time that the promotion of industrial, trade and investment results in the disarticulation of the economy

of the victims of imperialism. The exclusive quest of imperialism contrary to Hosbon (1938) and Schumpeter (1955) is the advancement of economic gains of the dominating countries. The Royal Niger was a tool for both colonialism and imperialism. Colonialism starts from political domination while imperialism relies on the power of the economy as a contrivance for exploitation of its victims. Colonialism uses political power while imperialism uses economic power.

Between direct colonialism and imperialism which is realized in neocolonialism, Cabral argues that they impoverish and inhibit national development. In order to develop, a country has to get rid of colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism. It was at this point Cabral theory falls under dependency theory. Tylor noted that the theoretical trust of the dependency perspectives was that capitalist penetration leads to and reproduces a combined and unequal development of its constitutive parts. The policy implication is that indigenous economic and social development in third world social formations must be fundamentally predicted upon the removal of industrial capitalist penetration and dominance (Tylor, 1979).

For Cabral:

The principle and permanent characteristic of imperialist domination, whatever its form, is the usurpation by violence of the freedom of the process of development of the dominated socio-economic whole (Cabral, 1980: 130).

At this point, Cabral joined his voice with the dependency theorists to denounce the possibility of imperialism to advance the economic benefits of the dominated people. Rather, imperialism is the usurpation by violence the freedom of the people to build their own economy. The relevance of international-dependence revolution as the theoretical framework of this research becomes obvious here. Cabral believed that foreign domination in the form of colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism are meant to pauperize the people that are dominated. It is important we recall that the neocolonial dependence model, as one of the models under the international-dependence revolution, holds that underdevelopment is a direct product of Western countries hegemonic dominance of world politics, using their military and economic power to, deliberately or not deliberately, to under develop the periphery countries. According to Todaro and Smith (2004), this model of development views developing countries as beset by institutional, political, and economic rigidities, both domestic and international, and caught up in a dependence and dominance relationship with countries (Todaro and Smith, 2004). For instance, in Latin America, IMF is referred to as MFI meaning *fome, miseria, inflacao* – famine, misery and inflation. For them, IMF represents the Western agencies of under developing the developing countries. IMF operations in the Latin America is said to have

brought famine, misery and inflation to their communities and their economy. For them, it is an agent of Western exploitation of the developing countries. One of the ways of redressing this exploitation of the developing countries by the developed countries is to revolt against foreign domination of all kinds – colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism – because the continuous flirtation with any of these will further under develop the developing countries. Foreign aids should not replace internal, self-generated endogenously induced development. Alien or foreign concepts and paradigms should be avoided because they could be tools of foreign domination. The Structural Adjustment Programme proposed by IMF and the World Bank to the developing countries further destroyed their economy growth and development. The people were at the receiving end of the consequences of the policies of Structural Adjustment Programme. At this juncture, we can recall the second model of our theoretical framework – International-dependence Revolution. The false paradigm model attributes underdevelopment to faulty and inappropriate advice provided by well-meaning but often uninformed, biased, and ethnocentric international “expert” advisers from developed-country assistance agencies and multinational donor organizations. These experts offer sophisticated concepts, elegant theoretical structures, and complex econometric models of development that often lead to inappropriate or incorrect policy (Todaro and Smith, 2004). The danger of always looking up to the West for growth and development puts the African states in a detrimental position. Africa ends up being object of exploitation. That is one of the points at the center of Cabral’s theory of development. Africa should look inward for development as against looking up to the West as a model of development and as their ‘messiah’ whose mission is the salvation of the souls of Africans from the doldrums caused by poverty and underdevelopment.

In Cabral’s words:

Whatever the formulas adopted in international law, is the inalienable right every people to have their own history: and the aim of national liberation is to regain this right usurped by imperialism, that is to free the process of development of the national productive forces (Cabral, 1980: 130).

This means that national liberation struggle (revolution) continues until there is a total liberation of the process of development of the productive forces. Imperialism has to be stopped.

The colonial State and Indigenous Corrupt Political Leaders

Cabral was never apathetic about retaining and maintaining the colonial state given its nature as a repressive tool in the hands of the colonialist. He therefore extensively argued that upon independence, the

colonial structure should be destroyed, if not, it could become a tool in the hands of the petty bourgeois, the nationalist bourgeois who wrestle power from the colonialist.

In his words:

We don't accept any institution of the Portuguese colonialist. We are not interested in the preservation of any of the structures of the colonial state. It is our opinion that it is necessary totally destroy, to break, to reduce to ash all aspects of the colonial state in our country in order to make everything possible for our people (Cabral, 1973: 83).

Colonialism interrupted the development of the people, fomenting stagnation for the process of natural state-building in Africa. It destroyed the growth of the internal economy of the African societies by intruding into the process; suppressed the development of indigenous industries and manufacturing sectors of the African societies. It disarticulated the economy of the colonized people. For this reason, Cabral saw the continual existence of the colonial structure as a challenge to the progressive development of the independent African States. In his words, the colonial structures/State should be destroyed, broken down and reduced to ashes so as to give room to development for the people (*in order to make everything possible for our people*).

Before we proceed further, it is logical to argue that what destroys people's development is an obstacle (impasse) to development. The colonial state under develops the people, given the goal of foreign domination as means of exploiting the dominated people. Given the role the colonial structure (State/government) played in exploiting the people, it would be a major inhibitor of the people's development if retained.

Ihonvbere (2010) underscored this thus:

Africa was programmed to fail with distorted and disarticulated structures and a marginal location and role in the global order....The state inherited was non-hegemonic and lacked the capacity to create the sort of environment that would have allowed public policy to be rational, sustainable, and effective. Africa did not inherit an environment that was conducive to democracy, growth, and development. The custodians of state power were equally set up to fail (Ihonvbere, 2010: 3).

Without destroying the inherited colonial state, Africa is doomed. The irony now is that after many years of 'independence', the colonial structure has been growing stronger, pauperizing the masses and 'prosperitizing' the political leaders. The colonial state is inimical to Africa's growth and development. Since it cannot produce development, it will hinder

development. The colonial state empowers African political elites as the new oppressors of their people. These new inheritors of state power were already conditioned by the neocolonialists and imperialists to fail. Thus, both the state and the new inheritors were programmed to fail.

On the colonial state and the new inheritors, Cabral posited that: Some independent African states preserved the structures of the colonial state. In some countries they only replaced a white man with a black man, but for the people it is the same. You have to realize that is very difficult for the people to make a distinction between one Portuguese, or white, administrator and one black administration. For the people it is the administrator that is fundamental. And the principle-if this administrator, a black one is living in the same house, with the same gestures, with the same car, or sometimes a better one, what is the difference? The nature of the state we have to create in our country is a very good question for it is a fundamental one (Cabral, 1973: 83).

For Cabral, the people are apathetic about who occupies the position of power - whether a white man or black man. They only look out for changes in the characteristics or features of governance. With self-governance should come liberty for self-development and the provision of the environment, policies and social goods that enhance holistic development of the human persons in the society. But the absence of all these stare us in the face in Africa.

Ake, reflecting on the colonial state and the emergence of African bourgeoisie, argued that;

The limited autonomy of the state in Nigeria has been rendered even more so by the colonial legacy of statism. The colonial state in Nigeria was a tool of colonial capital. It was used to coerce Africans into commodity relations, to change their pattern of production, to prevent the emergence of a competition African bourgeoisie (Ake, 1985: 10).

The colonial state in Nigeria was built under the ideology of statism, meaning a centralized government with regional and individual citizens being disengaged from the state. They have little say in political process. The colonial state produced competitive African bourgeoisie who further disengaged their people from the process of governance by initiating and implementing inhumane policies. It was this picture painted by Ake in the 1980s that Cabral was trying to address since his writings in the 1960s and the 1970s. This was why Cabral argued that the administrator body is crucial to the new state. It is not just about the black replacing the white, but rather the masses enjoying the benefits of their existence in a political community.

Cabral on the analysis of emergence of petty bourgeoisie held that: This indigenous petty bourgeoisie which emerged out of foreign domination and is indispensable to the system of colonial exploitation, stands midway between the masses of the working class in town and country and the small number of local representatives of the foreign ruling class (Cabral, 1973: 62)

Imperialism produced the petty bourgeoisie who stands in between the people and the imperialist. The structure produced by imperialists is such that it empowers the petty bourgeoisie to further disengage itself from its own people. The emerging class out of the colonial situation does not represent the class of the masses, thus, the colonialist had already created the possibility of continuous pauperization of the people. For him, the future of the post colonial African states is gloomy if the emergent class of the new rulers does not transform itself to become identified with the mass of the people, development would continue to elude the African states. This process of identification with the masses and liquation of his relation with the colonial/imperialist Cabral referred to as class suicide. For the petty bourgeoisie who have imbibed the culture of the colonialist and therefore conceived themselves as superior to the people, Cabral recommended spiritual conversion of mentalities, a re-Africanization which is possible through daily contact with the mass of the people and the communion of sacrifices which the struggle for decolonization and development demand (Cabral, 1980: 145).

In another place, Cabral called for total disengagement from the colonial state because of its ability to represent the imperialist states of the Northern hemisphere.

...we must not use the houses occupied by the colonial power in the way they used them. I proposed to our party that the government palace in Bissau be transformed into a people's house of culture, not for our prime minister or something like this (I don't believe we will have prime ministers anyway). This is to let people realize that they conquered colonialism – it's finished this time – it's not only a question of a change of skin (Cabral, 1973: 84).

The new political leaders should create their own administrative building in order not to replicate the oppressive status of the colonial state. He holds that the initial administrative buildings of the colonial masters should be converted to centers of culture of the people. The administrative offices created by the colonialist should be abolished and the people should create their own form of government. He continued that, "We now have popular tribunals–people's courts–in our country. We cannot create a judicial

system like the Portuguese in our country because it was a colonial one, nor can we even make a copy of judicial system in Portugal-it is impossible....It is similar to other systems, like the one in Vietnam, but it is also different because it corresponds to the condition of our country” (Cabral, 1973: 84). One of the points that should not be taken lightly is Cabral’s understanding of the need to always domesticate any borrowed concept and idea within the socio-cultural realities of the people borrowing the concept or the idea. The importation of foreign ideologies without transforming and adapting them to suit the experiential realities of the people is always counterproductive. The colonial state was created for the purpose of exploitation of the colonized; therefore to retain its existence under the leadership of indigenous political leaders is to foster continual exploitation of the masses.

Eghosa Osaghae underscored this thus:

The creation of the colonial state did not follow the dictates of any of the classical theories of the state which hold that states evolve from within society and reflect the historical experiences and ideals and ideals of society. The state was instead imported wholesale (bureaucracy, army, legislature, police, and other apparatuses) from the mother colony without due regard to African social structure or needs (Osaghae, 2000: 47).

The colonial state was one of the imported apparatuses to Africa without considering the social realities of the African societies. The real ideal of state formation is that the people outgrow their immediate ethno-cultural cleavages due to uncompelled interactions leading to natural fusion into a single state. The base of the fusion is the presence of overt or covert historical experiences. But for Africa, it was an imposition of this colonial state that has created the underdevelopment of the continent. The continual existence of such is more dangerous for Africa in this 21st century where Darwin’s evolutionary theory of survival of the fittest and the elimination of the unfit (ruthless quest for self-preservation and self-survival due to more pronounced scarcity of resources) is the rule of the game in international politics.

Cabral, reflecting on the predicaments of the post colonial state, posited that:

The problem of the nature of the state created after independence is perhaps the secret of the failure of African independence (Cabral, 1973: 84).

The state could be a major obstacle to the thriving of the people and the inhibitor of the development of the society at large. Cabral seemed to believe that the nature of the post independence state in Africa is the cause of the failure of most of the African states. The testimony of developmental

state of the Asian Tigers seems to re-enforce the central place of the state as either the facilitator of development or underdevelopment. The Asian Tigers have proved that democracy is not the only system of government that leads to development. However, one could argue that since development also entails political development, thus, that any country that is not democratic has denied its citizens one aspect of development (political development which entails political freedom).

Lee Kwan Yew, said:

I do not believe that democracy necessarily leads to development. I believe that what a country needs to develop is discipline more than democracy. The exuberance of democracy leads to indiscipline and disorderly conduct, which are inimical to development (cited in Bhgwati, 2002:1).

The missing link between democracy and development in Africa, to my mind, is this discipline.

The colonial state and liberal democracy it imposed on Africa produced leaders who have become indiscipline and irresponsible to their people. For Yew, democracy gives room for exuberance and disorderly conducts that are inimical to development. For instance, the Chinese political philosopher, Sun Yat-sen (1974) adopted Western democracy with the three arms of government namely Legislature, Executive and Judiciary, and goes on to add two arms – Examination and Control – adopted from China traditional system of governance. Sun Yat-sen's political thought is germane to modern China such that his three principles of the people formed the first line in the first Stanza of China's national anthem. The three principles of the people are nationalism, democracy (with five arms of government) and livelihood of the people (the people's welfare). This State formation integrated their traditional values into the borrowed alien concepts. Also, the people's welfare was integrated into the basic principles of governance of the state. In other words, there is a need for contemporary African political leaders to commit Cabral's proposed class suicide so as to integrate the people's welfare into governance. The class suicide is necessary so as to be able to identify with the needs and the plight of the masses. This question of class suicide has been subjected to series of criticism against Cabral as an impossible task. What Cabral was calling for was the need for the new political leaders, the petty bourgeoisie to prioritize the interests of the masses as primary purpose of governance as against their own class interests.

On the central place of political leadership in securing the loyalty of their people by considering them first, Cabral wrote;

And we must remind the comrades from the zones, above all them, of the importance local leadership has for retaining the people's enthusiasm. We cannot tolerate that a comrade

should be Political Commissar of any area for one, two or three years and should come to the end without having any authority, so that everyone does what he pleases and takes no notice of his leadership. This is a total failure for a comrade. And we must observe that some local leadership, which were working very well at the start, only began to do badly and to make mistakes when the leaders began to think of their belly, treating their area as if it were already independent and beginning to think of their own life (Cabral, 1980: 74).

From the above, Cabral argued that it is the task of the leaders to inspire the people about the ideals of nation-building. The leaders are to retain the people's excitement and loyalty to the nation. That explains the growth and the development in some fast industrializing nations of the Asian world. Even though they have strong leadership and one-party state, their commitment to the welfare of their citizens inspires the citizens' commitment to the pursuit of development. For Cabral, leadership fails when it prioritizes its own interests above the interest of the people – when it prioritizes personal interests of those in power above the interests of the mass of people. This explains the leadership failure in Africa.

It is of great importance to also note that Cabral did not see the Portuguese - foreign domination or the colonial state - as the only enemies of the people's progress. He identified with the thought of the possibility of internal enemies – some privileged proletarian and petty bourgeoisie. In his words:

But we face the question not only of liberation but also of progress for our people. And on this basis we quickly see that our struggle cannot only be against foreign, but must also be against their internal enemies. Who? All the social strata of our land, of classes of our land, who do not want progress for our people, but merely want progress for themselves, their family, their own. And so we say that our people's struggle is not only against anything that might be contrary to their liberty and independence, but also against anything that might be contrary to their progress and happiness (Cabral, 1980: 76).

Here, Cabral re-emphasized the fact that the revolution was needed in order to secure development (progress) for the whole populace. But he argued that there are certain forces, besides foreign domination represented by Portuguese colonialism, which will inhibit the possibility of the revolution leading to independent and development for the people. The struggle is not just for independence and liberty (freedom), but also progress and happiness of the populace. For Cabral, there are certain people who

enjoyed privileged authority and benefits from colonialism that would want to hinder the possibility of development for the people. These social forces would place their families and their private lives above the people. Cabral argued that such social forces (privileged indigenes) are the enemies of the people. They are the enemies of the people's progress and development.

Cabral further argued that the petty bourgeoisie, who have played a decisive role in the national liberation struggle for independence and development, are faced with the choice of either to betray the revolution by abusing the power accorded to them at the end of the revolution or integrate and decentralize their power in order to pursue people-oriented policies. According to him:

To maintain the power that national liberation puts in its hands, the petty bourgeoisie has only one road: to give free rein to its natural tendencies to become 'bourgeois' to allow the development of a bourgeoisie of bureaucrats and intermediaries in the trading system, to transform itself into a national pseudo-bourgeoisie, that is to deny the revolution and necessarily subject itself to imperialist capital. Now this corresponds to the neocolonial situation, that is to say, to betrayal of the objectives of national liberation (Cabral, 1980: 136).

The petty bourgeoisie could possibly transform and advance itself above the existence of the people. It could hijack the power of the state for personal aggrandizement. It could alienate the people and pursue development agenda that has no positive impact on the lives of the masses. It could deny the national liberation struggle which has the goal of securing independence and pursuing people's progress and development. It could subject itself and the whole state under imperialistic control so long as his immediate needs and wants are meant.

Ake's reflection on the structural adjustment programme in Nigeria buttresses Cabral's analysis of the role of the petty bourgeoisie (the new political leaders) in furthering the cause of the revolution (independence and development) or betraying it.

According to Ake:

In Nigeria, a political leadership torn between the fear of alienating the IMF and its patrons and the political repercussions of adjustment initiated a public debate over adjustment. Despite the government's effort to influence the debate, structural adjustment was overwhelmingly rejected. But the government went along with adjustment all the same (Ake, 1996: 32).

Despite the people's rejection of SAP, the government went on to implement the policies it proposed. SAP proposed the deregulation of exchange rate of local currency; trade liberalism, removal of certain subsidies; privatization and commercialization of industries and parastatals among others. The negative effects of SAP are still present till date in Africa. The political leaders knowing the effect, but because of selfish interests proceeded to executive this proposed ideology of the Northern hegemonic class represented by IMF and World Bank.

In his further reflection on the emergence of African bourgeoisie, Ake argued that:

The African bourgeoisie is also a creation of imperialism, in caricature as it were. It is a historically determinate form of the extension of the metropolitan bourgeoisie for the purposes of accumulation on a world scale. The African bourgeoisie shares to a considerable extent the consciousness, the tastes and life-style of the metropolitan bourgeoisie; that is what the popular phrase 'colonial mentality' really refers to. Most importantly, the common interest of both the African and the metropolitan bourgeoisies is to maintain the existing exploitative relations of production in Africa. Imperialism exploits Africa through these exploitative relations. The African bourgeoisie survives and exploits the African masses in so far as these exploitative relations of production are maintained. In short, the African bourgeoisie is an integral part of the structure of dependence (Ake, 1978: 53).

The imperialist nations, under the leadership of the metropolitan bourgeoisie, created the African bourgeoisie as an extension of their exploitative apparatus in order to continue to pauperize the African states and advance their own capital accumulation. The African bourgeoisie, given their identification with the colonial life-style, portray a false sense of security and prosperity, destroying their own economic and endangering the collective existence of their people. The state becomes the means of production in the hands of these African bourgeoisies, the resources become their own means of livelihood, and there is no distinction between the public treasury and personal treasury. The African masses suffer the effect of this exploitative partnership between the metropolitan bourgeoisie and the African bourgeoisie. This was the point Cabral made when he said the petty bourgeoisie could transform himself into bourgeoisie and subject his own country to the control of the imperialist countries.

Here again, our theoretical framework fits in perfectly. False paradigm as a subset of the international-dependence revolution holds that underdevelopment of the developing countries is as a result of wrong advice

provided by the imperialist countries through their agents with the intention to under developing the people of the other country. The African bourgeoisie delights in absorbing the advice and paradigm of the imperialist countries not minding the danger they pose to the welfare and the well-being of their people.

On alternative mode of behaviour for the petty bourgeoisie, Cabral argued that:

In order not to betray these objectives, the petty bourgeoisie has only one road: to strengthen its revolutionary consciousness, to repudiate the temptations to become 'bourgeois' and the natural pretensions of its class mentality; to identify with the classes of workers, not to oppose the normal development of the process of revolution. This means that in order play completely the part that falls to it in the national liberation struggle, the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie must be capable of committing suicide as a class, to be restored to life in the condition of a revolutionary worker completely identified with the deepest aspirations of the people to which he belongs (Cabral, 1980: 136).

The petty bourgeoisie class could deny itself the lofty pleasure of becoming a bourgeoisie class whose relationship with the masses would become that of a master – slave relationship. It could strengthen its revolutionary consciousness by its commitment to the cause of the revolution - independence and development for the indigenous people as against being a tool for advancing the development of the imperialist countries. It should identify with the workers and the masses. It should commit class suicide which implies its commitment to be identified with the aspirations of the mass of people who form the majority of the people in the society.

Some scholars felt that Cabral's recommendation of class suicide for the bourgeoisie is still too simplistic given the unrealistic tendencies of the petty bourgeois to give up their class status (Dada, 2010).

To my mind, this argument does not invalidate the viability of the class suicide. First, we must understand that Cabral's writings were never academic treatises, which means the logic of intellectual rigidity is avoided in his writings. Second, the class suicide is a call for re-prioritization of interests by the ruling class. The current argument in African politics especially with the focus on African political economy is the necessity of class suicide of the ruling class (though they have not been direct in the usage of this Cabral's concept). In other words, the whole argument about bad leadership, irresponsible leadership, irresponsive leadership among others all point to African leaders 'non-identification' with the masses. The present political leaders in Africa have to commit class suicide so as to serve

the people better. However, it worth of note that Cabral did not tell us how this process of class suicide can be achieved. One thing he went on to say is that the people have to hold their leaders responsible in order to ensure effective and faithful discharge of their responsibility to the masses first.

Our struggle is for our people, because its objective, its purpose, is to satisfy the aspirations, dreams and desires of our people: to lead a decent and worthy life, as all the peoples in the world want, to have peace in order to build progress in their land, to build happiness for their children. *We want everything we win in this struggle to belong to our people and we have to do our utmost to form an organization such that even if some want to divert the conquests of the struggle to their own advantage, our people will not let them.* This is very important (Cabral, 1980: 77 – Emphasis in mine).

From this quote above, the interaction between revolution and development is stated out again by Cabral. The struggle is for the people and its purpose is to satisfy the aspirations, dreams and desires of the people which are: to live a decent and worthy life, to have peace in order to build progress (development) in the land and also to ensure happiness for their children. The people should be the primary beneficiaries of the victory of the struggle; and an organization would be built to stall anyone who tries to hinder the people from benefitting primarily from the struggle. This organization could mean the civil society. But Cabral did not go on to develop this line of thought perhaps civil society, as an organization, was not a pronounced movement during the time he was writing in 1969. However, his belief that the people should be able to hold their leaders responsible is worthy of note. If Cabral meant civil society organization by the organization he referred to in the above quote, then we need to begin to rethink all over again the place of civil society in ensuring good governance in contemporary African states.

For Cabral, the ideology of the new state is zero tolerance for exploitation and corruption

To have ideology is to know what you want in your own condition.

We want in our country this; to have no more exploitation of our people, not by white people or by black people. We don't want any more exploitation. It is in this way we educate our people – the masses, the cadres, the militants – in this way. For that we are taking step by step, all the measures necessary to avoid this exploitation. How? We give to our people the instrument to control, the people lead. And we give to our

people all possibility to participate more actively each day in the direction of their own life (Cabral, 1973: 88-89).

On the impasses to development in Africa, we have identified two major forces. First is foreign domination – colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism. No matter the form it takes, foreign domination is always inimical to the growth and development of the dominated people. Second, the history of the post-colonial African states justifies Cabral's quest for ideal leaders who would turn their backs against the colonial state and build a new state, based on the social, economic, political and cultural realities of the African people, where social justice, peace and harmony, development and general happiness of the people would be secured. Till date, the question of nationalist and positive ideological leadership is still a missing link in our political lexicon in Africa.

Conclusion

It is an undying hope that one day, Africa will develop and transcend its current state of perennial underdevelopment. It is also clear from Cabral's interrogation of development in Africa that the crisis of development in Africa has nothing to do with the culture of the African people not with the literate level of the people. From his point of view, development in Africa can only be realized after proper decolonization from foreign domination (colonialism, neocolonialism and imperialism) and complete destruction of the colonial state have taken place. To take the argument further, the African people need to liberate themselves from indigenous corrupt and unskilled political leaders.

Until Africa returns to these, there can be no meaningful development in Africa.

References:

- Ake, C. (1978) *Revolutionary Pressure in Africa*. London: Zed Press.
(1981) *A Political Economy of Africa*. New York: Longman.
(1985) "The Nigerian State: Antinomies of a Periphery Formation", in Ake, C. (Ed.) *The Political Economy of Nigeria*. London: Longman.
(1996) *Democracy and Development In Africa*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institutions.
Bhgwati, J. (2002) "Democracy and Development: Cruel Dilemma or Symbiotic Relationship?" *Review of Development Economics*, 6(2), 151–162.
Blackley, R. (1974) "Fanon and Cabral: A Contrast in Theories of Revolution for Africa", *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 12(2): 191-209

- Cabral, A (1973) *Return to the Source: Selected Speeches of Amilcar Cabral*. New York & London: Monthly Review Press
- Cabral, A. (1969) *Revolution in Guinea: Selected Texts*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cabral, A. (1972) *Revolution in Guinea: Selected Texts*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cabral, A. (1980). *Unity and Struggle*. London: Heinemann.
- Chaliand, G. (1971) *Armed Struggle in Africa: With the Guerrillas in "Portuguese" Guinea*. Trans. by Rattray, D and Leonhardt, R. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Chilcote, R. H. (1984) "The Theory and Practice of Amilcar Cabral: Revolutionary Implications for the Third World". *Latin American Perspectives*, 11(2): 3-14
- Dada, S.O (2010) "Fanon and Cabral On Culture and National Liberation", *Lumina*, 21(1): 1-19
- Hobson, J. A. (1938) *Imperialism: A Study*. London: Longman
- Ihonvbere, J. O. (2010) "Reinventing Africa for the Challenges of the Twenty-First Century" *Being Text of the 2010 Annual Public Lecture of the Centre for Black and African Arts and Civilisation (CBAAC), Lagos, 22nd July*.
- Ihonvbere, J. O. (2004): "Constitutionalism and the National Question in Nigeria." In In Agbaje, A. A. B, L. Diamond, E. Onwudiwe (eds.) *Nigeria's Struggle for Democracy and Good Governance: A Festschrift for Oyeleye Oyediran.* , pp. 243-265. Ibadan: University Press
- Lenin, V. I. (1933) *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Petrograde: Little Library.
- Marx K. (1984) *A Contribution To The Critique Of Political Economy*. Moscow. Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1884/1973). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1958) *Selected Works*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House
- McCulloch, J. (1981) "Amilcar Cabral: A Theory of Imperialism", *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 19(2): 503-511.
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism*, London: Panaf Books.
- Osaghae, E. E (2000) "Rescuing the Post Colonial State in Africa" *The International Journal of African Studies*, 2(1): 55-69
- Schumpeter, J. A (1955) *A Sociology of Imperialism*. London: Meridian Books.
- Sun Yat-sen, (1974) *The Triple Demism of Sun Yat-Sen*. Trans. by Pasquale d'Elia. New York: AMS Press, Inc.

Todaro, M. P. and Smith, S. C. (2004). *Economic Development*. 8th Ed. New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Tylor, J.G (1979) *From Modernization to Modes of Production*. London: Macmillan.

Yew, L. K (2000) *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story, 1965–2000*, New York: Harper Collins.