When on January 20, 1973 the bullets of an assassin, hired by the Portuguese imperialists and their allies, eliminated Amilcar Cabral, the colonialists no doubt hoped that by the physical liquidation of one of this century’s most brilliant revolutionaries, they could halt the march of history; that they could somehow prevent the African people from recovering what has been their most natural right: the liberty to determine their own destiny. Unfortunately for those who endlessly discourse upon human rights but suppress them wherever they exist, events turned out differently. Guinea-Bissau, under the leadership of the P.A.I.G.C. („Partido Africano da Independencia da Guine e Cabo Verde“) went on to recover her right of independence. How did the small country of Guinea-Bissau, with very little natural resources, with a population of some 800,000, ninety seven percent of whom are, thanks to five hundred years of Portuguese civilising mission, still illiterate, manage to defeat Portugal despite the massive N.A.T.O. military aid? The story of this successful war of liberation is inseparable from the personality of Amilcar Cabral whose writings have now been edited by Mario de Andrade (Angolan), his friend and companion in arms.


Cabral’s analysis of social structure and the attitudes of the different classes in Guinea to national liberation constitutes a very important contribution to social science in Africa. As an agronomist in Guinea, Cabral was able to make a close study of the social structure in his country. His activities as a revolutionary leader enabled him to observe how the social and economic position of the various classes affected their attitudes to the struggle against colonialism.

The Europeans in Guinea were generally against the movement for independence. The chiefs and other elements dependent on them, for example, artisans, were hostile to national liberation. Most peasants tended to follow the chiefs and this of course presented a serious problem since peasants constitute a majority of the population. So far as Guinea is concerned, we have Cabral’s word that the peasants are no spontaneous revolutionary force. Much effort and patience was required to move them to act. The civil servants, members of the liberal profession, whom Cabral calls the compromised group, were generally on the side of the Portuguese: they had every thing to lose by the abolition of colonialism. Part of the African petite bourgeoisie supported the idea of liberation although the great majority of them clung to their hard won privileges in the colonial regime. The
déclassés-layabouts, prostitutes and the permanently unemployed, quite often served as secret agents of the Portuguese. The workers on the whole joined spontaneously the national liberation movement. The strongest support for the liberation movement came from those persons, mainly the young ones, who constantly move between the village and the town. These are the types, attracted by the city lights but are unable to secure a permanent foothold there. They were very useful for spreading the new ideas and many of the P.A.I.G.C. cadres came from this group.

Cabral insists that in the circumstances of Guinea, the only class capable of taking over the machinery of state, in the absence of a proper bourgeoisie or a class-conscious proletariat, is the petite bourgeoisie. This class must choose whether to ally itself with reactionary groups in the country and thus defend its class interests or join the workers and peasants in order to complete the revolution.

The P.A.I.G.C. is an avant-garde party which does not admit just anybody: it insists on some understanding of the principles and objectives of the party. Some of these principles are: collective leadership, democratic centralism, revolutionary democracy, criticism and auto-criticism. The cult of personality, not even that of Cabral, was to be tolerated in the Party.

Cabral considers culture as an important element in the struggle for national liberation and also appreciates the need for a return to one's cultural roots. But he objects to the mystification of the masses in the name of inherent African cultural values whether this be under the name of nègritude or African personality. He is for a re-evaluation of African culture in order to determine which elements are relevant to present day problems.

A constant theme in Unité et lutte is African unity. The struggle in Guinea was for Cabral, only a part of the general struggle of the African peoples against imperialism. He expected the fight for unity to be a long one but he was confident of its eventual realization.

It is not possible within a short review to do justice to the wealth of ideas contained in Cabral’s writings. One thing however is certain: Unité et lutte will take its place besides Les damnés de la terre and Neo-colonialism.
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Jeunesse, Famille et Développement. Essai sur le changement socio-culturel dans un pays du Tiers Monde (Tunisie)
Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris 1973, 506 S.

Das Buch befaßt sich mit einem Teilproblem der Akkulturation, indem es die sozio-psychologischen Effekte auf die tunesische Familie durch den Zusammenprall zweier gegensätzlicher Wertsysteme beschreibt — des herkömmlichen, von islamischer Tradition geprägten und des europäischen, im wesentlichen französischen Wertsystems. In seinem 1. Teil wird das klassisch-islamische Familienbild mit seiner Rollenverteilung auf die einzelnen Angehörigen — Ehemann, Ehefrau, Kinder und andere männliche Verwandte — dargestellt. Dabei geht der Verfasser davon aus, daß bis zum Beginn der französischen Kolonisation die Familie in ihrer in Tunesien vorherrschenden Form als Großfamilie ein intaktes Gebilde mit festgefüg-