Africa and the Challenges of Citizenry and Inclusion: The Legacy of Mário de Andrade

Carlos Lopes

The Cheikh Anta Diop Lecture
(CODESRIA General Assembly, Maputo, December 2005)

Monograph Series

The CODESRIA Monograph Series is published to stimulate debate, comments, and further research on the subjects covered. The series serves as a forum for works based on the findings of original research, which however are too long for academic journals but not long enough to be published as books, and which deserve to be accessible to the research community in Africa and elsewhere. Such works are usually case studies, theoretical debates or both, but they also incorporate significant findings, analyses and critical evaluations of the current literature on the subjects covered.

Contents

Introduction

To many of those here present, the name of Mário de Andrade will not immediately arouse any particular attention. To others, however, it is an important name.

Imagine then that in 1954, in Paris, the young Mário Andrade was reading the proofs of a book that would serve as a work of reference to African intellectuals: *Nations Nègres et Culture*, written by Cheikh Anta Diop. This leading authority had just completed his masterpiece but was ill and needed assistance. Thus it was that, through this work, the younger Andrade learnt about the functions of a literary artisan. His restless spirit had already caused his boss and employer, the other Diop, some displeasure. Here, we are referring more specifically to Alioune Diop, founder of *Présence Africaine*, a periodical which was recognized at the time as being crucial to the affirmation of an incipient political identity.

At the outset, nothing had foreordained that this young Angolan would become the editor of a French language magazine, and have the capacity even to read the proofs of Anta Diop. Well, in truth, his studies in linguistics had gifted him with an etymological and syntactical rigour that he never neglected. At a very early stage, the dictionary, which Andrade jestingly referred to as the 'father of the gifted', became his greatest friend. But at the *Présence Africain*, he began his work as private secretary of the one whom he admired and who had little money with which to remunerate him.

Next, we shall make mention of the meanderings of life that lead Mário de Andrade to experience many other encounters with History. As an eternal dissident, it is natural that he should have become an eternal exile. And so, it was in this ambulation from place to place that he visited the city Bissau during the post-independence years of the 1970s. It was there that I had the pleasure of meeting and working with him, and thereafter becoming his self-confessed follower. He passed away fifteen years ago.

On having been invited to present this lecture, it immediately occurred to me that I should link it to Anta Diop through the generational connection that leads me to Mário de Andrade; possibly also because in undertaking a re-reading of the legacy of the latter, we arrive at the theses of the former (including their limitations), as well as at the need to contextualize such proposals in terms of the crucial debates that we face today.

Let us have no illusions: African intellectuals are divided, their theses have limited credit, their responses are tentative, their role is still held very much in contempt and, consequently, their influence is very limited. I believe that the example of Mário Andrade is highly significant in order to understand the current challenges facing African intellectuals, especially for those of us who occupy the Lusophone bloc.

I am going to divide this lecture into four parts: I shall start by succinctly presenting the times of Mário Andrade and the generation that preceded him (and which he himself designated as being proto-nationalist). Then, I shall present a critical vision of African nationalism and of its revolutionary proposals. Thereafter, I shall talk about the triumphs and vicissitudes of Negritude and of Pan-Africanism. That will allow us, finally, to analyze the consequences for a country's citizenry, inclusion and respect of identities; and to conclude with a question about what all of this means to African intellectuals.

How It All Started

Mário Coelho Pinto de Andrade was born in Golungo Alto, province of Kwanza Norte, on 21 August 1928. His father, José Cristino Pinto de Andrade, a bank clerk, was one of the founders of the African League. His mother was a descendant, albeit somewhat destitute, of a family of farmers. In good African style, Mário de Andrade's parents were separated and their respective relatives were of a diverse background. The moulding of his personality was marked by the rural way of life offered by his mother's family, with whom he spent some time, but perhaps more intensely, by his entry into the Catholic Seminary of Luanda, where he studied with his brother, Joaquim, with the ex-cardinal of Luanda, Dom Alexandre do Nascimento and other luminaries of the Angolan nationalist movement.

In describing Luanda of the 1930s, Mário de Andrade, in his posthumous *As Origens do Nacionalismo* ('The Origins of Nationalism'), speaks of myriad institutions, newspapers and processes that evolved simultaneously in the various Portuguese colonies of Africa. References are obviously made to the rest of the continent and to Brazil, but not in any noteworthy way. These movements valued the sons of Africa, rather than those in whom they were not interested. The members of these movements almost always rebelled against the lack of attention on the part of authorities, bureaucratic indifference and injustice towards local knowledge and issues, as opposed to those emanating from mainland Europe.

Without wanting to detail the complicated, yet fascinating, evolution of these movements, also called native or nativist, the truth is that they made more and

more demands of a political nature. This view would ultimately determine their future: the struggle for rights, and within this struggle, the defence of full citizenship.

But was it in fact full citizenship, as possibly conceived today? No. The proto-nationalists, as they were nicknamed by Mário Andrade, evinced many contradictions and thought that local African values were associated with their capacity to play a leading role; that is, the proto-nationalists – learned, cultured and knowledgeable, in the widest sense of the terms – should, they reasoned, have the same rights as other Portuguese citizens. Their demands, however, went no further.

Influenced by the manner in which Brazil became independent, the Portuguese elite distanced itself somewhat from its European colonial counterparts, in the legitimization of its colonizing activities. Although not all democratic in nature, during the whole of the Portuguese republican period, the colonies were always represented within the central legislative powers, if only for the purposes of justifying a centralizing ideology: a single, united nation, divided into various territories. This was the long-standing dream of the Brazilian sociologist, Gilberto Freyre, who involuntarily became a theoretical exponent of the so-called 'Portuguese exception'. He believed that 'the world which the Portuguese had created' was more cordial, kind and less prone to an absolute and racist domination. In reality, such a world was more perverse and its existence was justified with different arguments because it was not strong enough to dominate economically that which it held on to. For this reason, this world was more defensive, having transformed itself into the most centralizing of empires. Yes, an empire with a weak centre, but with a different ideology.

It is not untrue that the Portuguese created archipelagos of socially perverse relationships and 'creolized' even the movements that, subsequently, would give rise to the anti-colonial struggle. It began with the proto-nationalists: mainly Blacks, but also people of mixed race and even native Whites co-opted for the cause.

The urbanization process of the 1930s favoured the flourishing of typical districts, such as Ingombotas, which besides Km 5, as mentioned by Mário de Andrade, congregated not only families such as his, but also those of Bento Ribeiro, Viana, Mingas, Vieira Dias and Van-Dunem – all names readily recognized by any novice of Angolan politics. Mário de Andrade was not just any old member of this community since, at a very early age, he had been recruited by various colleges of the city of Luanda to teach Latin and Portuguese. For a Black person without any kind of university education, this was a truly phenomenal feat. He went on to teach famous people such as Carlos Ervedosa and Uanhenga

3

Xita. His brother, subsequently transferred to the Gregorian University of Rome, also taught and, thereafter as a priest, performed the duties of Secretary of the Archdiocese of Luanda – until he was imprisoned in 1960 by the Portuguese authorities, for 14 years. In this interim period, he was elected in 1962, as honorary President of the MPLA. We are talking, therefore, of two noteworthy figures of the same family who greatly influenced the course of the Angolan political discourse.

His father's generation, which Mário de Andrade pejoratively referred to as being a lumpenaristocracy; inasmuch as 'they were assimilated, they were men who truly believed themselves to be the defenders of traditional values' (Andrade 1997a: 35). However, they used to read the Brazilian authors, as well as Gogol and Gorsky, and many of them divulgers of 'A voz de Angola clamando no deserto' ('The voice of Angola crying out in the wilderness'), an essay of 1901, which served as a reference work for the edification of a struggle identity.

Few Blacks had the opportunity to study, since the rigid assimilation policies were gainfully used by only certain prominent Blacks, those who were able to frustrate the meshes of bureaucratic discrimination. As regards social discrimination, that was simply something else. Even so, the privileged individuals who stood out went to Lisbon. It was with some difficulty then that, in 1948, Mário de Andrade managed to make his way towards the Portuguese capital. Before leaving for Lisbon he made a number of promises, including the one made to his literary club friend, Viriato da Cruz, that he would always remain attuned to his native land. Viriato da Cruz, who would later found a series of communist movements, was one of the original founders of the MPLA. He died in exile in China.

Although Mário de Andrade remained in Lisbon for only five years, to any contemporary historian, it would have seemed to be longer. It was during this time that the unrest witnessed within the Casa dos Estudantes do Império (Association of the Students of the Empire) resulted in the creation of the Centre for African Studies, the publication of various essays and poetry exalting Africanicity and Negritude, and the development of ideas that would subsequently lead to the creation of the Portuguese colonies' more radical nationalist movements. The exponent of this process was, indubitably, Amílcar Cabral, whose name Mário de Andrade affectionately associates with the whole of his generation: the Cabral generation. But it was Mário de Andrade who was the cultural exponent of this generation.

In their own words, they began to 're-Africanize their spirits' to understand that Blacks were entitled to more than just rights, that they were entitled to their own independence. In order to enjoy full human dignity, they had, first of all, to

4

acquire their self-determination. The reading and circulation of Marxist ideas provided them with a solid basis to conceive a new form of unitary struggle, capable of understanding the complexity of the colonial reality. The strength of these movements emanated from their unitary nature, which reinforced itself on the basis of a collective concept of Africa and its national struggles.

These movements did not evince any contradiction between the defence of Blacks and their profoundly humanistic and all-inclusive outlook. They received their initial support from Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia (then led by Bourghiba, one of the great contributors to African nationalism) and Egypt (then led by Nasser). Ben Bella's and Fanon's subsequent roles would be simply magnetic. To a lesser extent influenced by the nationalists from other quarters, they mythicized the independence of the Ethiopians and enthusiastically supported the process of the creation of the OAU.

Nonetheless, and without a shadow of doubt, it was the intellectuals and the Diaspora who provided the initial enlightenment. As such, Mário Andrade's move to Paris was decisive. In Lisbon, his greatest literary influences were Nicolas Guillén, Alan Patton, Léopold Sédar Senghor, Aimé Cesaire, Roy Albridge, Countee Cullem, Langston Hughes and the Brazilians Lins do Rego, Jorge Amado and Graciliano Ramos. In Paris, the librarian of the group would broaden his horizons, becoming acquainted with – besides his university professors Georges Gurvitch, Georges Balandier and Roger Bastide, who were the fathers of modern French sociology – others, such as Ferdinand Oyono, Richard Wright, René Maran, Eza Boto, Bernard Dadié, Ray Autra, Albert Camus, Jean-Paul Sartre and René Depestre.

Included in this enriching gamut of literary luminaries are William Dubois, Cesaire, Senghor, Anta Diop and so many other writers and Black artists who participated in the Pan-Africanist Congresses in London, Paris and Rome that Mário de Andrade helped to organize. It was during this time that the first contradictions in the interpretation of Pan-Africanism began to surface, polarized as they were, around DuBois and Marcus Garvey – one being American and the other Jamaican.

According to Andrade,

> a conceptual convergence based on a utopian vision of Africa was manifested once again. Founded on the theoretical conviction of the superiority of the African-Americans acquired during the process of slavery, Marcus Garvey, 'an extraordinary leader', in Dubois's own words, discerned the organization of the construction of the continent from L i b e - ria, a country whose economy was based on a model forged in the United

5

>States of America, according to the Western paradigm of civilization. (Andrade 1997b: 161)

The decades of the 1950s and 1960s were the time of the continent's independence struggles. The FLN of Algeria, Kwame Nkrumah and Sekou Touré created the bases to harbour nationalists from all quarters. This assistance was gainfully utilized by the nationalists of the Portuguese colonies. It should come as no surprise, then, that Mário de Andrade began visiting Algiers, Casablanca and Accra more frequently, having moved to Conakry in 1960, the year of the independence of African countries. Various reasons accounted for this decision, but the most important had to do with the presence of Amílcar Cabral, who had assumed the leadership of the Frente Revolucionária Africana para a Independência (Revolutionary African Front for Independence), which in 1961 became the Conferência das Organizações Nacionalistas das Colónias Portuguesas (CONCP) (Conference of the Nationalist Organizations of the Portuguese Colonies), which Mário de Andrade, as secretary-general, in fact, led.

Before establishing himself in Conakry, Amílcar Cabral had created the Partido Africano para Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC) (African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde) and contributed towards the unification of the various Angolan nationalist movements that, in the crucial year of 1956, would lead to the founding of the MPLA. The MPLA's first executive committee was established in 1960, with Mário de Andrade w chosen as its first president. I shall presently explain why he quickly gave way, in 1962, to Agostinho Neto.

Mário de Andrade, who presided over CONCP, resumed his intellectual toil and served as external link to the various movements. During the beginning of the 1970s he participated, under dramatic conditions, in the eastern front's armed struggle. However, in 1974, just before Angola's independence, he took sides against the so-called presidentialist wing of Agostinho Neto. As was the case with other leaders, including his brother Joaquim, he was pushed towards a dissident faction that would become known as 'the Active Rebellion'.

On 11 November 1975, with various warring factions involved in a raging civil war that would last another 30 years, Angola became independent. But before Mário de Andrade could even participate in the choices of the country for which he had been an indefatigable fighter, he was accused of fomenting political divisions and had to seek refuge in Guinea-Bissau. The then president of the newly-independent Guinea-Bissau, Luís Cabral (brother of Amílcar Cabral), welcomed him as the biographer of the Guinean and Cape Verdean hero, and thereafter nominated him president of the National Cultural Council, and later still, as minister of information and culture. Mário de Andrade, who energeti-

cally carried out his cultural activities, remained in Guinea-Bissau until the *coup d'état* of November 1980.

Once again, he went into exile and passed away in a London hospital ten years later. It was enough time for him to write seminal works, perfect his contribution concerning the role of intellectuals, before being buried in Luanda with state honours in his country of birth – to which he returned only in a coffin, and which never granted him a passport.

Nationalism and Revolutionary Beliefs

It would certainly be interesting to carry out an analysis of the African nationalist discourse. What counts, however, is to reflect on the context in which the beliefs of Mário Andrade concerning the nation and nationalism evolved, and to demonstrate how current his analyses still are.

Mário de Andrade was first influenced by respect for the need of evidencing an African historicity. At the time, the objective was to refute the Hegelian proposition that there was no African history. This era, which I have designated as 'inverted pyramid', revealed that the likes of Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Teóphile Obenga and others championed the belief that the history of Africa was an antithesis of that which had been said for a long time. Certain hasty formulations and certain analogies and comparisons revealed excesses. In hindsight, the profoundness of Cheikh Anta Diop should be highlighted.

A profound humanist, he attempted to demonstrate that the contribution of Blacks to universal history was irrefutable, reaching its zenith through Egyptian civilization. In so doing, he developed various theories, the most intriguing being that which postulated that pigmentation and melanoma were manipulating factors of Western civilizational thinking. Speaking of the biological unity of human beings, Anta Diop submitted that

> ... le problème est de rééduquer notre perception de l'être humain, pour qu'elle se détache de l'apparence raciale et se polarise sur l'humain débarrassé de toutes coordonnées   ethniques.. (Diop 1982: 138)

It is only natural that Anta Diop should have defined the national issue in terms of a counterpoint to the idea of a Western civilization. As a renowned Egyptologist, he proved that the presence of Blacks in the composite of universal modern values was recognized even by the Greeks. In the context of his era, the right to a contradicting viewpoint was unusual. It was something that few could do with Anta Diop's quality and audience. But there were some excesses. Thus he stressed, somewhat dubiously, the idea that the biological unity of humans could only be shared by means of cultural and not civilizational experiences, given

that the bases of such civilizational experiences represent a contribution of all. And in the specific case of Egypt, especially of the Blacks. Therefore it was understandable that he should confuse 'nation' with 'culture', the latter containing the specificities of alterableness. But this was erroneous, since the actual concept of racial purity that Anta Diop denounced so vehemently served equally as a basis for the differentiation.

This issue was debated at the time and is still being debated today. Where did Mário de Andrade stand when it came to this discussion?

In designating his father's generation as proto-nationalist, Mário de Andrade was admitting that the struggles fragmented by the dignity of the sons of the land elicited a certain point of view. He, the son, ultimately formed part of a generation that fought for the right to self-determination and independence; and he did so, supporting the idea that a nation was a utilitarian instrument used to unify fragmented struggles. Or rather, that it was a convenient social invention that gained shape, thanks to the contribution of the protagonists themselves. So it was too, in relation to Pan-Africanism, another hypothetical construct invented by the militant Diaspora that did not possess its own territorial identification on the continent.

Social constructs were common in the Marxist debates of those times. With the reinterpretation of national will offered by the Paris Commune, nationalism became associated with class struggle. Kwame Nkrumah entitled his main work *Class Struggle in Africa*, Fanon developed the theory of substitution of the revolutionary and nationalist character of the proletariat with African farmers and peasants, and Amílcar Cabral theorized that the whole of the colonized population would transform itself into a national class.

In order to complete these theoretical artifices, it was necessary to provide the historical grounding that Anta Diop and his companions were able to do. In inaugurating the first carbon-14 laboratory in Africa, Anta Diop symbolically demonstrated the necessary capacity to date the facts, proof of the antiquity of the historicity under construction – a fundamental element of African cultural nationalism.

If culture served as a matrix, then he had to have a striking mode of alterableness, in relation to the cultural values of the colonizer. Almost automatically, this alterableness was found in the character of Blacks, something that was excluded from the system of colonial assimilation. Even Fanon, from Algeria, recognized this, showing that this claim of Black alterableness was not a racial struggle, and even less, a racist struggle.

This nationalism echoed the tenets of Negritude. Mário de Andrade admired the MP Aimé Césaire for parting ways with the French Communist Party be-

8

cause of the French Communists' inability to integrate the cultural dimension of the colonies within its class struggle equation. Andrade found this position to be more courageous than Senghor's, who saw in the Negritude option only a eulogy of Black aesthetics, complementary, if not comparable, to Western aesthetics. But the contradictions increased. How was one to distinguish between the anti-colonial struggles that were genuinely only 'contra' from the sophisticated nationalist developments? Moreover, it clearly dealt with a nationalism that did not incorporate nation, limited to the various definitions adopted at the time. All of them revolved around the exaltation of common qualities, such as language, religion, ancestry or culture.

With the coming into power of various Pan-African leaders, some of the differences between the nationalism of the Asian and the African revolutionaries were revealed. The movement that led to the May 1968 protests started to stir debates on the French political left which, owing to the key importance of Algeria in the continent's liberation, was also cause for debate among the nationalists.

Mário de Andrade, for his part, once again turned to the teachings of António Gramsci: the complexity of the study of reality, with a view to transforming it (as conceived by the principle of the organic intellectual). He realized that the cultural dimension was better captured by demonstrating that the nationalist struggle was a form of civilizational exaltation. Amílcar Cabral's view was that the liberation struggle was a demonstration of personal will, and thus was considered to be a cultural act. For this same reason, the struggle was not against individuals but rather against systems. The strengthening of the humanist character arose because of the reservations that both Cabral and Andrade had as regards what the independence of African countries revealed, especially the authoritarian drift of Nkrumah and Sekou Touré, whom they knew better. This was also the case with respect to the tendencies that they themselves observed within their own movements. Andrade and Cabral began speaking more frequently of the study of reality, and of the need to have a specific historical knowledge of each reality in order to be able to transform it. The insistence on local historicity is unequivocal. The bridge between the humanistic and historical notions of Anta Diop and the teachings of Gramsci had thus been established. Nonetheless, certain weaknesses about the specific character of nationalism subsisted.

Mário de Andrade, in his last days, wrote that

> it would convenient, then, to question whether one or more factors (amongst language, territory, economic life or cultural community) in isolation or in combination could discharge the role of accelerator of the

9

process of human (or community) organization in nations. (…) Notwith-
standing the illusions of the era, the so-called states of 'national democ-
racy' did not produce paradigmatic examples of the subject under debate
[nationalism]. For its part, the edification of African unity (which implied
a reshaping of   the inherited colonial borders)
did not, at a continental level, result in national   c o n s o l i d a t i o n .
(Andrade 1997b: 16–17)

Negritude and Pan-Africanism

African politics is marked by known paradoxes: the struggle for the territorial
integrity of inherited arbitrary borders versus Pan-Africanist ideology; the dis-
course about national construction versus the troubled multi-ethnic reality; the
adoption of development precepts versus unmanageable distributive market
forms; the promotion of the citizenry versus the extension of authoritarian prac-
tices that perpetuate the 'subordinate' status of people; the rejection by the elites
of imported institutional models versus *nouveau riche* forms of appropriation
and consumption. The list is not exhaustive.

Many of these paradoxes are not unique to African post-colonial states; but
here in Africa, they do exhibit some specificities that revolve around two prob-
lems that have not been adequately resolved and that Mário Andrade greatly
reflected upon: the racial issue and Pan-African ideology. Both issues are based
on human constructions inasmuch as both race and geography are abstract
entities, created by the dynamics of history.

Let us commence with the racial question. Race, in a biological sense, does
not exist. All so-called 'racial' differences, in terms of phenotype, are limited to
0.001% of the human genome. Research in the social science field demonstrates,
without difficulty, that the use of phenotypical differences among human groups
to legitimize the domination of some over others has existed almost permanently
throughout the world. Other permanent forms of domination are those of gender
and class. In spite of the fallacious nature of the concept of race, and of the
dismantlement of its pseudo-scientific value, it is undeniable that, as a social
construct, it is something that is real. It also joins groups of people who share
observable physical aspects, such as skin colour, hair texture and body com-
plexion. If such a social reality exists, it is only natural, then, that the intellectu-
als should concern themselves and try to explain the phenomenon.

After having witnessed the sour discussions between the two fathers of
Negritude (Senghor and Césaire) and between these two and the exponents of
the American Diaspora who claimed a Pan-African identity based on colour,
(that is, based on being Black), Andrade concluded that a great deal of the rea-

10

soning originated from the exclusion that Blacks had been subjected to, from slavery to colonial domination. This was the primary motivation behind the struggle for independence. In 1953, in the preface to an anthology of Black poetry, Andrade wrote:

> This anthology (…) is not intended (…) for those who, to delude their prejudices and their racism, accuse us of racism. It is meant fundamentally for those who know how to find themselves reflected in this poetry (…) and understand that Blacks also exercise their own specific voice in the larger human symphony of life. (Mata 2000: 137)

As a an ideology, racism was founded by the French thinker, Joseph-Arthur Gobineau (1816–82), whose doctrine consisted of three points: (a) the existence of various human races; (b) the understanding of the differences between races as essential factors of the socio-historical process; and (c) the affirmation of a superior race. This ideology served as the point of departure in the twentieth century for the Briton Stewart Chamberlain (1855–1927) to disseminate, in Germany, the myth of the superiority of the Arian race. Alfred Rosenberg (1893–1946) lent, after World War I, a pseudo-scientific veneer to these theories, and thus helped Adolf Hitler in trying to justify his actions, despite the disastrous consequences that are known by all. As regards this issue of a racist construct, Europe cannot exactly pride itself.

The impact of these theories on Europeans' outlook towards Africa was devastating. As shown by Mudimbe, the constant reference, either implicit or explicit, to the inferiority of Blacks converted itself into an African inferiority.

The counterpoint to this negation simmered during the 1950s and 1960s, and obviously then, the era of the political independence of African countries was filled with the need, almost imperative in nature, to show that the races were not only equal, but that Africans were in fact superior. This could be seen, namely, in the revolutionary nature of the African struggle for liberation. It was through the revolution that Africans inspired the Europeans left and that their leaders were venerated in the progressive universities and centres of knowledge – a whole post-war generation, committed to the profound transformation of Western societies, pulsated with the advance of the self-determination and independence of the African nations.

It should be remembered that a large part of the leaders of the independence struggle had a Western intellectual audience that was certainly superior to the current political leadership of the continent. It can therefore be said that the claim in counterpoint – the inverted pyramid – the affirmation of the Black man and of Negritude served to construct a significantly powerful ideology.

11

Mário de Andrade was one of the architects of this ideological construct. But he always did this with a certain degree of scepticism. His criticism of the Negritude discourse, and of the luso-tropicality of the Brazilian Gilberto Freyre, had already started in the 1960s. As ethnic and racial discourse penetrated the core of the liberation movements (with conflicts and competition between people of mixed races and Blacks), he started to question the grounds for giving added value to Blacks at the expense of humanistic principles. Together with Amílcar Cabral, Andrade found the answer in the cultural dimension of national liberation. This was a sophisticated discourse and ideology – completely different from the many armed gangs that have now sprung up in Africa. A recent survey identified 48 such gangs in the ECOWAS region alone. It was Fanon who said that the adulteration of history and the acts of marginalization carried out by the national middle classes on the basis of ethnicity, race or religion would lead to conflicts and organized violence.

Most of CODESRIA's debate about these issues treats race as a founding concept. In this way, the complexity of the topic is diminished and the extent to which it already contained many contradictions, even during the liberation period, is not recognized. This is not something that was invented recently. The debate between Fred Hendricks and Suren Pillay (Pillay 2004) pertaining to the relationship between race and class in South Africa today only confirms that racial classifications are also ideological constructs. As I shall try to prove below, the evolution of the knowledge about identities forces us, however, to re-read the whole issue.

Negritude, as a basic foundation, is a fiction. One cannot reduce a continent to one single race (Pillay 2004). What then does it mean to be an African? What is the genesis and justification of another omnipresent ideology: Pan-Africanism?

Edward Said demonstrated, in a definitive fashion, that West and East are abstract creations of man and, as often happens, the ideological constructs of the strongest and most powerful are more invasively disseminated. The term 'East' was created by the West:

> (…) Orientalism [said Said] occupied such a position of authority that I believe that nobody who wrote or thought about, or acted on, the East could do so without realizing the limitations that it imposed on thoughts and actions. In short, because of Orientalism, the East was not (and is not) the object of free thinking or action. This does not mean that Orientalism determines unilaterally that which may be said about the East, but rather that it represents a whole network of interests that are

12

> inevitably invoked (and are hence therein implied) when the East is an issue, (Said 1997: 3–4)

This analysis is valid in relation to Africa and even to Pan-Africanism. However, it must be explained under what circumstances this is so.

Following the same line of thought, Mudimbe showed that the geographical idea of Africa began by being a Western creation. This is somewhat curious, since the division of the world into West and East leaves Sub-Saharan Africa in limbo. It is almost as if it were a sub-product of Orientalism. Subsequently, various determinisms will be associated with the geographical concept of Africa. According to Mudimbe, Africa has, since the fifteenth century, been compared to a pseudo-scientific and ideological mixture that includes semantic fields of the concepts of primitivism and savagery, imported from the idea of barbarism; all of which would serve to justify the traffic of slaves (Mudimbe 1994). Mudimbe demonstrated with precision the appropriation of the concept of Africa by the African political movements, and he also showed how, surreptitiously, an ideology generated its counterpoint: Pan-Africanism.

Based on the fitting central idea, Mudimbe sometimes disproportionately attacks the construction of ideologies based on Marxism, and next, by indirect association, Pan-African ideologies. The one has very little to do with the other. He forgets about the transforming role these ideologies based on Pan-Africanism had on the cultural mobilization of Africans, and on their self-determination and transformation. These attacks launched by Mudimbe led to a polarization of the followers and detractors of Pan-Africanism – a division that is as ridiculous as discussing who is for and who is against Orientalism, Pan-Arabism, Asiatic values, etc. Such ideological constructs should serve as an intellectual tool of historical analysis and should not be used as weapon to attack opposing viewpoints.

Today, However: Quo Vadis Pan-Africanism?

Mário de Andrade offers us some cues for reflection. As far as he was concerned, the historical memory of the Diaspora was fundamental to the understanding of those who left, but also to the understanding of those who remained, as a result of the trafficking of slaves. Based on this perception, he himself dedicated the last years of his life to incessant research work at Diaspora memorial centres such as that which exists at Howard University in Washington DC, or the Schomburg Centre in Harlem, New York. This research was merely a continuation of the search for the fascination that the African-Americans had exercised over the Luso-African proto-nationalists, as he called them:

13

> a privileged referent of the African Renaissance (…) Attentive to the events pertaining tothe Black peoples of the world, the ideologues and publicists contribute to the universalization of the discourse about race. (Andrade 1997a: 184)

And he adds that they only contributed to a process of rupture and continuity:

> (…) essentially, proto-nationalism produced a discourse with an illusory purpose (…) they had not attained the necessary critical level required for a logical comprehension of the Portuguese colonial system (…) And therein, then, resides the point of rupture expressed by the generation that would make its entry onto the historical scene straight after World War II. (Andrade 1997a: 186)

This rupture which gave rise to the nationalist movements was important, yet insufficient. As far as Mário de Andrade was concerned, a new, post-independence break in relations was inevitable. This break was needed to affirm the principles of inclusion, plurality and protection of minorities, an idea that led to him being included in the MPLA's Active Rebellion, a self-confessed intellectual movement similar to the *aggiornamento* of the European left, which opposed centralism and authoritarian tendencies. In this vein, he began questioning the ideological manipulation of Pan-Africanism by the leaders of the newly independent states, as a means of legitimizing authoritarian powers.

This questioning was more important than wanting to undertake an unceasing consideration of who was, or was not, African. As Olukoshi and Nyamnjoh have said, the issue of Africanity is a debate that is waged by those having power, whether they be the elites, the leaders, the middle class or the intellectuals. For the great majority of the African masses, Africa is a real experience, a struggle for dignity and humanity.

> For these people, the fact of their Africanicty is not in question, nor is it an issue (…) It is to be assumed, however, that all those who claim Africa will define their roles, and this includes respecting their obligations towards the continent. (Olukoshi and Nyamnjoh 2004: 2)

Citizenry, Inclusion and Modernism

Any ideology consists of three aspirations: (a) the construction of a set of ideas, to be utilized by an ascending class or group; (b) its transformation into something that can be seen as common sense; (c) its imposition, in the name of all citizens, by the new ruling class. Very often this evolution occurs in an intuitive and rational manner. An ideology is a representation, not something real.

14

During the national liberation struggle, the prevailing ideology varied according to the countries and territories being considered. Even so, it was possible to discern some points of convergence around Pan-Africanism, nationalism, development and the role of the state in the justification of the three abovementioned pillars. A few post-independence decades later, it is possible to make a critique of the ideologies that became common sense and that are today a characteristic quality of the ruling classes. When it comes to this critique, African intellectuals should position themselves in the front line.

For some, this debate has been carried out as if there were a need to preserve the ideologies in a static form. Others, however, believe that all the arguments that underpinned these same ideologies should be cleansed. Some arguments are interesting. For example, the support of a post-colonial vision, renewed with post-modernist theories, might be appealing. It would force people to be self-critical of the silent posture revealed by certain intellectuals in situations where there was clear deviation from, and manipulation of, nationalistic and Pan-Africanist ideologies, in order to further authoritarianism and exclusion. Others are fallacious because they see Africa as being an appendix to Western anthropological reflections, now clothed in politically correct language and justifying an African tendency towards riots, conflicts or disintegrating and foolish management of power. Therefore, it is not very appropriate to import simplistic, post-modernistic or post-colonial classifications. Mário de Andrade's exhaustive biographical studies concerning Cabral's work had, as one of its principal concerns, the dissemination of these admonitions.

It would be absurd to associate nationalism and Pan-Africanism with authoritarian behaviour. Mário de Andrade would condemn this notion vehemently. But he also admitted – and his own life was a good example of this – that the citizenry and inclusion dilemmas were pre-independence phenomena. Amílcar Cabral was one of those people who most comprehensively articulated these dangers (Lopes 2005a). Claude Ake was, without a doubt, also concerned with these issues. In their *African Intellectuals*, Thandika Mkandwire et al. offer a fierce indictment of the censorship that these ideologies led to, as well as the role of intolerant states in impeding autonomous thought (Mkandawire et al. 2005). However, the association of intellectuals with authoritarian powers should remind us of the complicity of some of them.

As explained by Mkandawire, this debate, curiously enough, is associated with the definition of good governance. During the process of preparation of the prospective studies of the World Bank on Africa, in 1989, various African academics were assembled. In the preface of the final World Bank document, it was recognized that academics had been responsible for a change in thinking pre-

15

sented in the study, with respect to issues of governance. This group   of
academics included, among others, Claude Ake, Makhtar Diouf and Ali Mazrui,
all of whom agreed that in order to overcome the challenge of development, it
was necessary to establish states-society relations with the following character-
istics:

- They should be developmental in nature, in the sense that they should
  allow a type of economic management that would maximize economic
  growth, bring about structural changes and use resources in an efficient,
  competitive and sustainable fashion;

- They should be democratic and respectful of the rights of citizens;

- They should be socially inclusive, providing dignifying conditions and
  allowing for participation in national processes. (Mkandawire 2004)

Good governance should be understood as the implementation of these three
pillars, and not as if it would afterwards end up being popularized.

Any one of these characteristics is related to modern-day thinking. In com-
paring the Arab and Western Renaissances, Samir Amin explained that the link
with religion was fundamental to the success of the one in relation to the other.
The laicism of the state, inspired in ancient Greece, allowed the West to embrace
an emancipatory modernity, necessary for the consolidation of capitalism and
democracy. In the specific case of the Arab Renaissance of the nineteenth cen-
tury, it did not go beyond the parameters of the Muslim religion, that is, it did not
break away from the traditional concepts and restrictions of freedom (Amin
2004). It can be said that all of Africa battles with similar problems. According to
Paulin Hountondji, in considering the icons of the past, one has to recognize the
deficiencies of his modernist discourse: 'Today it is necessary to appropriate
this contribution in a lucid, critical and responsible manner' (Hountondji 2004:
104).

The popularization of multi-party democracy, from the end of the 1980s,
considerably changed the continent's political landscape. Originally, this trans-
formation was brought about by a series of external and internal factors. On the
external front, it was the end of the Cold War-inspired changes in the conti-
nent's economic and commercial relationships, a growing international isola-
tion, structural adjustments and pressures exerted on countries to implement
institutional reforms. On the domestic front, it was exasperation with the lack of
political alternation, urbanization, demographic growth, a more radical and
desperate youth, the struggle for women's rights, an increasing economic in-
equality and the appearance of civic movements.

16

As a keen observer, Mário de Andrade lived through these transformations during the last years of his life, whether in Maputo, Praia, Paris or Lisbon. The restrictions on freedoms witnessed in most of the continent concerned him, as did the intolerance and kowtowing caused by excessive power. He abhorred the rites associated with power. But nothing caused him greater despair than the exclusion of the continent's citizenry. Since he himself had been a victim of such political practices, he was able to witness it as being the clearest sign of the hypocrisy of the supposed nationalist and Pan-Africanist nature of a number of African leaders.

The number of countries that applied policies of exclusion based on origin, race, ethnicity, religion or political affiliation expanded. If Amílcar Cabral were alive today, at a certain point, he would have been deprived of his original (Guinean) nationality – just as other important still-alive nationalist leaders have been. Mário de Andrade contented himself with 'borrowed' nationalities, thus practising a pragmatic Pan-Africanism, which today, is more and more rare.

The debate around *Ivoirité* is merely the pinnacle of a much larger problem that affects almost half of the continent's countries. Intellectuals have to denounce these practices and cannot hide behind dated philosophies. It is increasingly recognized that the planet has only one, single atmosphere and economy, that it has a broader international law and more fluid means of communication. This also assumes a greater need for global ethics, that is, an ethical system capable of recognizing identity rights based on the principle that development brings with it more opportunities and more freedom of choice.

Amartya Sen states that

> freedom is central to the process of development for two reasons: 1) an evaluative reason: an evaluation of the progress made has to be undertaken considering essentially whether there has been an increase in people's freedom; 2) a reason of efficacy: the realization of development depends entirely on people's ability to act as free agents. (Sen 2002: 18)

The measurement of these two reasons adduced by Sen can be evaluated by considering the level of citizenry and inclusion of modern societies. This is an African debate. This is a challenge for African intellectuals, which hopefully will guarantee that the sons of Africa, such as Mário de Andrade, do not have to wait for a passport until they die.

Carlos Lopes, New York, November 2005.

17

Please Note: The opinions expressed herein are solely and exclusively those of the author.

References

Ackerman, Robert John, 1996, *Heterogeneities: Race, Gender, Class, Nation and State*, Amherst, MA: University of Massachussets Press.

Akindes, 2004, *Les racines de la crise militaro-politique en Côte d'Ivoire*, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Amaral, Ilídio do, 2000, *Em torno dos nacionalismos africanos. Memórias e reflexões em homenagem a Mário Pinto de Andrade (1928–1990)*, Porto: Granito.

Amin, Samir, 1976, *Le développement inégal*, Paris, Maspero.

Amin, Samir, 2004, 'Modernité et interpretations religieuses', *Africa Development*, XXIX, no. 1, pp. 7–53, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Andrade, Mário Pinto, 1997a, *Origens do nacionalismo Africano*, Lisboa: Dom Quixote.

Andrade, Mário Pinto, 1997b, *Uma entrevista a Michel Laban*, Lisboa: JSC.

Andrade, Mário de and Ollivier, Marc, 1974, *A Guerra em Angola*, Lisboa, Seara Nova

Andrade, Mário de, 1980, *Amílcar Cabral*, Paris: Maspero.

Anjos, Jose Carlos Gomes dos, 2003, 'Elites intelectuais e a conformação da identidade nacional em Cabo Verde', *Estudos Afro-asiáticos*, ano 25, número 3, pp. 579–96, Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Cândido Mendes.

Ake, Claude, 1996, *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Appiah, K. A., 1992, *In My Father's House: Africa in the Philosophy and the Order of Knowledge*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cabral, Amílcar, 1977, *Unidade e Luta*, 2 vols, Lisboa: Seara Nova.

Cardoso, Carlos, Macamo, Elísio and Pestana, Nelson, 2002, 'Da possibilidade do político na África lusófona. Alguns subsídios teóricos', *Cadernos de Estudos Africanos*, numero 3, pp. 7–26, Lisboa: CEA/ISCTE.

Chabal, Patrick and Daloz, Jean-Pascal, 1999, *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*, London: James Currey.

Chauí, Marilena, 2004, *O que é ideologia*, São Paulo: Editora Brasiliense.

Crehan, Kate, 2002, *Gramsci: Cultura e antropologia*, Lisboa: Campo da Comunicação.

Diop, Cheikh Anta, 1982, 'L'unité d'origine de l'espèce humaine', *in Actes du colloque d'Athènes: Racisme science et pseudo-science*, coll. Actuel, pp. 137–41, Paris: UNESCO.

Hountondji, Paulin, 2004, 'Philosophie et politique. Pour une discussion avec Lansana Keita', *Africa Development*, XXIX, no. 1, pp. 95–106.

Londsdale, John, 2005, 'African Studies, Europe and Africa', mimeo presented at AEGIS Conference, London: 30 June.

[Lopes, Carlos (ed.)], 1989, *A construção da nação em Africa. Os exemplos de Angola, Cabo Verde, Guiné Bissau, Moçambique e S. Tomé e Príncipe*, Colóquio INEP/CODESRIA/Unitar, Bissau: INEP.

Lopes, Carlos (guest editor), 2005a, 'Special Issue on Amílcar Cabral', *African Identities*, London: Routledge.

Lopes, Carlos, 2005b, *Cooperação e Desenvolvimento Humano*, São Paulo: UNESP.

Macey, David, 2000, *Frantz Fanon: a biography*, New York: Picador.

18

Mafeje, Archie, 2001, 'Anthropology in Post-independence Africa: End of an Era and the Problem of Self-redefinition', *African Social Scientists Reflections*, part 1, Nairobi: Heirich Boll Foundation.

Mamdani, Mahmood, 1996, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, London: James Currey.

Mata, Inocência and Padilha, Laura, 2000, *Mário Pinto de Andrade: um intelectual na política*, Lisboa: Colibri.

Mbembe, Achille, 1999, 'Getting Out of the Ghetto: The Challenge of Internationalization', *CODESRIA Bulletin* 3–4, pp. 17–28, Dakar, CODESRIA.

Mbembe, Achille, 2000, 'African Modes of Self-writing', *Public Culture*, 14, no. 1, pp. 239–74, Duke University Press.

Mkandawire, Thandika, 2004, 'Good Governance', *D+C*, 31, no. 10, Germany: D+C.

Mkandawire, Thandika (ed.), 2005, *African Intellectuals*, London: Zed Books.

Mudimbe, V. Y., 1994, *The Idea of Africa*, London: James Currey.

Olukoshi, Adebayo and Nyamnjoh, Francis, 2004, 'Editorial', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no. 1–2, pp. 1–2, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Pereira, José Maria Nunes, 1990, 'O legado de Mário de Andrade', *Estudos Afro-Asiáticos*, número 19, pp. 3–5, Rio de Janeiro: Universidade Candido Mendes.

Pillay, Suren, 2004, 'The Mask of Race? Thinking About Race After Apartheid: A Response to Fred Hendricks', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no. 1–2, pp. 4–7, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Pimenta, Fernando Tavares, 2005, *Brancos de Angola. Autonomismo e Nacionalismo (1900–1961)*, Lisboa: Minerva.

Ridley, Edgar J., 1992, *An African Answer: The Key to Global Productivity*, Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Robins, Steven, 2004, 'The (Third) World is a Ghetto? Looking for a Third Space Between "Postmodern" Cosmopolitan and Cultural Nationalism', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no. 1–2, pp. 18–26, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Said, Edward, 1997, *Orientalism*, Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press [first published 1978].

Sen, Amartya, 2002, *Desenvolvimento como liberdade*, São Paulo, Companhia das Letras

Shivji, Issa G., 1989, *The Concept of Human Rights in Africa*, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Singer, Peter, 2004, *Um só mundo: a ética da globalização*, São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Whitaker, Beth Elise, 2005, 'Citizens and Foreigners: Democratization and the Politics of Exclusion in Africa', *African Studies Review*, 48, no. 1, pp. 109–26, New Jersey: ASA.

Zeleza, P. T. , 1997, *Manufacturing African Studies and Crises*, Dakar: CODESRIA.

For a more detailed bibliography of and about Mário de Andrade, see: Kajibanga, Victor, 'Mário Pinto de Andrade: subsídios para o estudo biográfico', in Mata et al., 2000.