The National Liberation Movements

Sharpening of the Class Conflict
Samora Machel

Excerpt from speech given by the President of FRELIMO, at Symposium in Homage to Amilcar Cabral, Conakry, 31 January 1973.

Because the process of armed liberation struggle is not homogeneous in all parts of the national territory, it can happen that we experience different phases simultaneously in our countries. Whereas in one area the immediate task will be to launch armed struggle, in another the task will be to strike deeper roots, while in yet another the aim will be to establish the structures which make the liberation process irreversible. These heterogeneous situations demand of the leadership, of the militants who constitute the vanguard in the fight, an ideological clarity without which one runs the risk of misconstruing the struggle.

Knowing who should exercise power in a village and on behalf of which social group, deciding on the system of ownership, on how to organise trade — these are immediate and tangible questions which the whole people are capable of understanding and absorbing, so long as we do the necessary political work. In other words, it can be said that once the physical presence of the enemy has been destroyed, a new and more decisive conflict arises. The class struggle at an international level, between our people and the colonialist and imperialist enemy, is followed, at the internal level, by a class struggle against national forces with an exploitative bent.

It also means that the previous dividing line between colonisers and colonised has to be further completed by an even deeper dividing line between exploiter and exploited. This dividing line affects every field, and primarily the ideological and cultural fields. Ideas, values, habits, usages and customs, all the unconscious standards which regulate the everyday behaviour of the individual, are expressions of the ideology and culture of the existing society.

It so happens that we were all born into an exploitative society and have been profoundly imbued with its ideology and culture. This is why an internal fight against what we believe to constitute our moral framework is difficult and may at times seem impossible.

Divesting ourselves of the exploitative ideology and culture and adopting and living, in each detail of everyday life, the ideology required for the revolution is the essence of the fight to create the new man.

It is not the personal fight of one man wrapped up in himself. It is a mass struggle in which we accept criticism and do self-criticism, purifying ourselves in their fire, which makes us conscious of the path to be followed and fills us with hatred for the negative values of the old society.

When we launch this process, on the one hand the establishment of popular structures of political power and, on the other the fight to acquire a new mentality and behaviour, we are opening the doors to serious contradictions in our midst.
Discontent will arise. All those who were hoping to exploit the people, to step into the shoes of colonialism, will oppose us. Erstwhile companions of ours who initially accepted the popular aims of our struggle, but who in practice reject the internal struggle to change their values and customs, will move away from us to the extent of deserting or even betraying.

The successes achieved militarily, the feeling of the imminence of victory, will hasten the process of the discontentment of a handful of elements frustrated in their ambitions and corrupt tastes. In this way, a breach is made in our ranks through which the colonialist and imperialist enemy will penetrate.

The reactionary forces, the disgruntled elements, will see in an alliance with the enemy a way of safeguarding their petty and anti-popular interests, while the enemy will find in such an alliance a golden opportunity to strike a blow against the Revolution.

In the critical phase through which we are passing of the sharpening of the internal class conflict and the military and political defeat of the enemy, the protection of the Revolution and of its leaders, the survival of the revolutionary structures and of their cadres, depends now more than ever, on the masses.

No Communist Influence
Artur Vilankulu

*Unpublished letter to New York Times replying to an article and sent on 6 April 1972 by the Representative to the US of the Comite Revolucionario de Mocambique (COREMO).*

To the Editor:
Without going into the East-West ideological squabble, let me say that it is a serious misconception to judge African nationalism as a result of either one’s influence. Both the East and the West should have learned by now that Africans are neither pro-East nor pro-West, but pro-Africa. This thinking includes those of us in Southern Africa who are fighting for our freedom and independence.

Communism is a new concept in the world, but colonialism and imperialism are not. More than half the world population has suffered some kind of colonialism and that includes North America. One can say that North Americans were some of the first to fight against British imperialism, and certainly George Washington was not influenced by the ‘Communists’ to fight the unjust exploitation of man by man. Indeed he was influenced by the democratic spirit which allows people to choose their own form of government and decide their destiny without foreign influence. Likewise the people of Mozambique have been fighting Portuguese colonialism since the Portuguese arrived in our country.