

A META-ANALYSIS OF AMÍLCAR CABRAL'S THOUGHT

Carlos Cardoso

Centro de Estudos Sociais Amílcar Cabral (CESAC)

Bairro de Bô, Rua Pe. Ermanno Battosti, s/n

carlos.cardoso28@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0009-6605-1234

CRedit: conceptualization, writing – original draft

A meta-analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thought

This article argues in favour of the need for a meta-analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thought, bringing together the contributions of some authors who have examined his theoretical legacy. It emphasises the relevance of this method, generally used in other sciences to investigate a particular problem or area of knowledge, with a view to deepening our understanding of Cabral's thought. The article argues that, rather than being content with quotations that do not allow us to deepen the debate on his thought, those who propose or are called upon to speak about it should interrogate the categories, analytical tools, and methodologies used by Cabral in his abundant reflections, speeches, and notes.

Keywords: meta-analysis, theoretical legacy, Cabralian studies, development studies, culture, theory building

Uma meta-análise do pensamento de Amílcar Cabral

Este artigo advoga a favor da necessidade de uma meta-análise do pensamento de Amílcar Cabral, trazendo à colação contribuições de alguns autores que se debruçaram sobre as suas contribuições teóricas. Nele se enfatiza a relevância deste método, geralmente utilizado noutras ciências para investigar uma determinada problemática ou área do saber, com vista ao aprofundamento dos nossos conhecimentos sobre o pensamento de Cabral. O artigo defende que, mais do que se contentar com citações que não permitem aprofundar o debate sobre o seu pensamento, aqueles que se propõem ou são chamados a falar sobre o seu pensamento devem interrogar as categorias, os instrumentos de análise e as metodologias usadas por Cabral nas suas abundantes reflexões, discursos e notas.

Palavras-chave: meta-análise, legado teórico, estudos cabralianos, estudos de desenvolvimento, cultura, construção de teorias

Recebido: 01 de junho de 2024

Aceite: 21 de junho de 2024

The author of this article recently took part in a conference organised by the Centre for African Studies of the Institute of Political and Social Sciences (ISCPS) of the University of Lisbon, entitled "Other readings of Amílcar Cabral". The title could not have been more appropriate given the plethora of biographies and other writings dedicated to this illustrious son of Africa. Although the idea has been bubbling in our minds for at least a decade, we venture now to produce a paper dedicated to the subject of the meta-analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thought for the first time. This is perhaps still an idea that is no more than a "plea", a working proposal, but which, in our opinion, deserves to kickstart a discussion of Amílcar Cabral's thought from a different perspective. More recently, in December 2024, on the occasion of Cabral being granted the posthumous title of *Professor Emeritus* at Colinas de Boé University, in Bissau, much of our academic praise was dedicated to this subject. The positive echo has encouraged us to continue on this path.

Amílcar Cabral continues to inspire many people, not just Africans, who see him as a model statesman who was not only able to reconcile theory and practice, but who made this dialectic one of the central elements of his thought. Fifty years after his death, the year in which we celebrate the centenary of his birth all around the world, it seems more than appropriate to revisit his legacy and celebrate his posthumous triumph.

In this article, we therefore decide to revisit the essence of the reflections developed on these two occasions, with the intention of sharing them with a wider audience and perhaps being able to gather comments from those who, in one way or another, have published their reflections on his thinking. The aim is to bring to the debate a specific way of dealing with the theoretical legacy of Amílcar Cabral, based on the assumption that at any given moment, when we approach his thought and work, rather than being limited to quotations from his writings, we should place the focus on the confrontation between the use and interpretations of the categories and instruments of analysis used by him, in light of the current contributions of the social and human sciences. As seen from its use in other sciences such as medicine, agronomy and ecology, meta-analysis is essentially quantitative, but it is not this we seek to discuss here. There are aspects implicit in meta-analysis that can be useful for the exercise we propose and that, according to the Novo Aurélio Século XXI Portuguese language dictionary, are linked to the definition of the term itself, namely "change", "transcendence" and, mainly, "critical reflection on". Meta-analysis, then, would be analysis that changes or transcends the results of previous analyses, and is a critical reflection on them. In other words, to configure a meta-analysis it is not enough to merely analyse the results of previous work qualitatively, as one would in a review, be-

cause a new statistical analysis of the data or results is essential for the process to be given this designation.

What these pages offer is nothing more than the beginnings of a task that deserves to be continued and deepened in future reflections and is therefore just the first step of a long journey. Therefore, we have no pretension to create a thesis that covers all aspects of the issues that the task entails. Rather, our aim is to revisit the contributions of some thinkers, in particular second-generation scholars from Guinea-Bissau, such as Carlos Lopes, Rosemary Galli, Patrick Chabal and others, who studied the thought of Amílcar Cabral (Havik, 2016). Essentially, what is proposed is a study of Cabralian studies (Neves, 2017), which we conventionally call "meta-analysis". This method is, partially at least, suitable for our purposes, insofar as it was specially developed to integrate the results of several studies on the same research question in a systematic review of the literature. However, it should not be confused with a simple bibliographic review, but rather be seen as a systematic method used to find and critically evaluate all the scientific evidence available about a research question.

The article is divided into three parts, the first of which attempts to provide reasons that explain why this exercise is important. Here the concept of meta-analysis is revisited and the first meta-analytical approaches to Amílcar Cabral's thought are analysed. The second section is devoted to the meta-analysis itself, placing the emphasis on the debate about the uniqueness – or not – of Amílcar Cabral's thought, the need for such an exercise in the current context and, subsequently, analysing the centrality of two concepts in his theoretical edifice: culture and development. In the third part of the article, we discuss some final considerations.

Why now a meta-analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thought?

The question posed by many who, for one reason or another, are called to speak or write about Amílcar Cabral is the following: What remains to be said about the man and his work, when we already have countless writings dedicated to this great leader, including several biographies, some of which are quite exhaustive, such as those by Patrick Chabal (2002) and Julião Soares Sousa (2016)?

Several contemporary experts recognise that instead of decreasing with time, the number of works on Cabral has increased and that, invariably, the relevance of his thinking is recognised universally (Lopes, 1984; Manji & Fletcher, 2013; Mendy, 2019). In a recent bibliographic survey, covering the period between 1963 and 2020, the Amílcar Cabral Foundation, in Cape Verde, reported the exist-

ence of at least 445 texts published about Amílcar Cabral and the History of the National Struggle for Liberation, of which more than a hundred were written in the last decade alone. And, according to this work, these works are by authors from countries as diverse as Senegal, Japan, Lebanon, France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, Portugal, Guinea-Bissau, Angola, South Africa, Brazil, Russia, Cuba and the United States of America, on subjects as diverse as History, Political Science, Philosophy and Anthropology.

This proliferation of studies and analyses of Cabral and his thinking justifies the search, today more than ever, for increasingly effective methods of understanding and interpretation. In addition to this increase in the number of publications, it is important to note the significant speed at which works are now disseminated via the internet and the modern ease of access to this information. Rather than focussing on quotations that, although important, do not advance the debate about his thinking, we must question the categories, the instruments of analysis and the methodologies used by Cabral in his abundant reflections, speeches and notes. Seen from this perspective, it is important to revisit what different scholars have written about the concepts he used, in order to develop a convincing synthesis of their writings and interpretations regarding his thinking and deepen our knowledge about his theories.

This approach is not new, nor is it taken in isolation. At the opening of the Amílcar Cabral exhibition of March-June 2023 at the Baldaya Palace in Lisbon, the curators said:

Our admiration for Cabral was not the main reason why we agreed to organise this exhibition. It was the historiographical curiosity that he arouses in us. A curiosity stimulated by the discovery of new aspects of Cabral's trajectory, and, above all, by the variety of interpretations and representations to which his life has been subjected. This is, in fact, an exhibition about Amílcar Cabral's past, but also about the people who made and continue to make sense of that past. Forgive us for using an odd word, but it's a meta-biographical exhibition (Neves & Pires Martins, 2023).

What is meta-analysis?

As we know from other sciences (Medicine, Agronomy and Ecology), and as mentioned above, meta-analysis appears to be an appropriate method to suit our purposes, as it was specially developed to integrate the results of various studies on the same research question, into a systematic review of the literature. It should not, however, be confused with a simple bibliographic review, however exhaustive this may be, since, in this case, it is the systematic method used to find and critically evaluate all available scientific evidence on a research question. The

main objective of systematic reviews is to minimise the chance of type I error, or systematic error, eliminating studies with a high risk of bias and reducing publication bias. Meta-analysis can best be described as a synthesis of previous research on a topic, which emphasises quantitative conclusions. However, it is not a specific data analysis technique, but rather a paradigm from which the researcher adopts a new approach when gathering results and conclusions from others, and it is from this perspective that it has particular interest for us. In sciences such as Agronomy or Ecology, this data generally comes from published works, but can be obtained from records of different institutions, or be a mixture of the two, with new data collected by the person executing the meta-analysis. In any case, and like any tool, meta-analysis is not a panacea, but it presents obvious advantages in the cost/benefit ratio of research, and it is up to researchers to understand it in order to be able to use it well (Luiz, 2002).

According to Finney (1995), cited by Luiz (2002), the term was used for the first time, in the sense adopted here, by G.V. Glass in 1976 in an article entitled "Primary, secondary and meta-analysis of research", in the journal *Educational Research* (Luiz, 2002). Before that, several studies had used statistical techniques to combine or gather data already published or used in other studies, without having coined a specific term to define the method used. The emergence of a specific term to define this procedure occurred as its use increased significantly in various areas of knowledge. The explanation for this growth in the popularity of meta-analysis over the last three or four decades may lie in the current explosion of information that the entire world, and in particular the scientific or academic world, is experiencing (Luiz, 2002).

In terms of meaning, the prefix meta- has several meanings. Among them, "change", "transcendence" and, mainly, "critical reflection on", which are well-suited to the approach proposed in this article. A meta-analysis, then, would be an analysis that changes or transcends the results of previous analyses, and is a critical reflection on them. Furthermore, and quite literally, according to the definition we have decided to favour, we can state that meta-analysis is an analysis of analyses (Luiz, 2002).

The need for a "meta-analysis" of Amílcar Cabral's thought in the current context

We said that in relation to Cabral's ideas, this method of heuristic exploration is not new. It was initiated by a group of thinkers some have come to call the second generation of Guinea-Bissau scholars, such as Rosemary Galli (1984), Carlos Lopes (1984) and Patrick Chabal (2002), but merits continued and further

development. Indeed, it is in academic debate that lies the possibility to deepen the understanding of Cabral's thought. It is, also as we take this path that we see, for example, the comparison of Cabral's thought with that of other great names such as Samir Amin or Paulo Freire, not to mention the countless works that have attempted to explore similarities and differences with the thought of Frantz Fanon. This was brilliantly initiated, for example, by Gustavo Koszeniewski Rolim (Rolim, 2016) by contrasting the conception/theorisations of the two thinkers regarding blackness, violence and the petite bourgeoisie, or themes dear to Marxism such as mode of production, relations of production, productive forces, and class struggle, among other subjects.

A prominent place in the comparative approach of this latter author is occupied by the problem of revolution and culture, as well as the petite bourgeoisie and revolution/liberation. In this article, we will focus essentially on the first pair of categories, namely revolution and culture. Regarding the concept of culture in Fanon's thought, Rolim argues that "we must keep in mind that he does not refer only to abstract academic forms, but rather to structural forms of production and reproduction of systems, in this case, colonialism and racism" (Rolim, 2016, p. 182). Therefore, for Fanon, engagement in the recovery of culture must be in order to justify its action in the struggle of the present, placing itself at the centre of the struggle for liberation, and not as an addendum: "Fighting for national culture is, first and foremost, fighting for the liberation of the nation, the material matrix from which culture becomes possible" (Fanon, 1979, p. 194, cited according to Rolim, 2016, p. 184).

It is hard to find any other quotes in Fanon that bring us closer to Cabral's concept of culture as an act and factor of liberation. Hence, Rolim considered that, for Cabral, the revolution was only possible based on a detailed study and the most accurate and dense understanding possible of the colonial reality and of his country, so that revolutionary theories were in harmony and strategic and tactical errors could be avoided. The immediate consequence of this would be the constant and permanent practice of theoretical elaboration and adaptation – not only in the creation of revolutionary theory but also in the adaptation of the main theories and references to the reality that one wishes to transform. This reality also contains its cultural facet, a key element for national liberation (Rolim, 2016). This author makes it clear that one of the causes of concern for these two thinkers in relation to the role of culture in revolution was precisely their perception of the specificities of the colonial system, an upside-down system, embodied in the fact that its domination was not only due to economic factors, but it was due also to the rationalisations and cultural constructions that existed to sustain such a

system. Rolim goes on to say that without defeating one, it would be impossible to defeat the other.

According to this author, we see here a mature notion of dialectical conception and the totality of society. Even though many of the starting points of both authors (Fanon and Cabral) were based on the issues of the time – Cabral reproduces “schemes” of revolution and focuses too much on the “schematic reading of the relations of mode of production, productive forces and means of production”, while Fanon uses the “nation” as the base from which national culture will emerge – the practice of both revolutionaries, concludes Rolim, is far from being discarded because of this. Cabral avoids, on the one hand, schematism when he inverts and arranges these concepts in his own way to adapt them to the reality of his people; and Fanon knows only too well that a nation, just like a culture or even a revolution, is constructed in the strictest sense of the word. Both revolutionaries, according to Rolim, gave their lives and did what was within their reach to produce a new theoretical interpretation of their reality and a truly emancipatory practice that broke with a system based on exploitation and pain (Rolim, 2016).

Another author who thought problematically about Cabral's thinking in relation to culture was Branwen Gruffydd Jones. She inserted the discussion of the concept into the broader debate about its meaning in relation to Negritude, attempting to demonstrate that, contrary to the Senghorian concept that saw culture explicitly framed in terms of race, but avoided questions of class, colonialism and national liberation, Cabral establishes a relationship between the notion of culture and colonialism. Gruffydd Jones attempts to demonstrate that Cabral and his colleagues were indeed influenced by Senghor and Negritude, but they overcame the limitations of Negritude to develop a position that differed significantly from Senghor's. According to her, Cabral's argument that the struggle for national liberation was an act of culture directly echoed the position expressed by Fanon in Rome in 1959.

Branwen showed that Cabral and his colleagues developed a radical analysis of the role of culture in national liberation based on their critical reflections on their difficulties and influences from Fanon (Gruffydd Jones, 2020). She explored how anti-colonial activists in Portuguese colonies developed their most radical understanding, above all through a critical reflection on their own situation as assimilated people, since the imperatives of armed struggle demanded increasing clarity with regard to race, culture and liberation, explaining that if the experience of assimilation was the basis for the early adoption of Negritude by Cabral and his fellow students, their critical reflections on the condition of the assimilat-

ed people also formed a common thread that took them beyond Negritude. Over time, Cabral's engagement with the question of African culture and the relationships between culture, colonialism and liberation became increasingly different from Senghor's.

In agreement with Gruffydd Jones, we can say that Cabral's thinking was thus inspired by the theoretical contributions in vogue at the time, but that these never stopped being shaped by notable criticism.

Carlos Lopes also considers that Amílcar Cabral took advantage of Marxism and that in his thinking dialectical materialism dominates over theoretical influences, mainly over African intellectual currents, although he admits that "we do not find a Marxist orthodoxy, nor a blind idealism" (Lopes, 1984, p. 67). He also recalls that when journalists asked him whether he was a Marxist or a communist, Cabral invited them to judge him by his actions and not by their labels (Lopes, 1984). According to Lopes, Cabral uses Marxist language (modes of production, productive forces, class struggle, historical realities, revolution, etc.), and above all, he masters the concepts, dialectically applying Marxist thought to the concrete reality of Guinea, contrary to Kwame N'Krumah, who was never able to adapt the revolutionary concepts of socialism to the social conditions of Africa (Lopes, 1984).

On the other hand, beyond the political-ideological and philosophical imperative, the theoretical facet of Cabral's writings should make us think, given the heuristic challenges that we face, and so understand our time, the connections and the different trajectories that link our present to our past, to raise the debate on his thought to new levels of abstraction, conceptualisation and theorisation never before achieved. To the extent that a theory analyses, explains, and predicts, it should be part of any serious scientific enterprise.

The construction of theories, or at least the attempt to involve the social sciences practised in Africa in the broad movement to produce new explanations of contemporary social dynamics on a global scale, is not one of the strengths of the social sciences currently in force on the continent. Generally, they tend to operate within or with theories and concepts produced in the global North. The social and human sciences – including History, Geography, Psychology, Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Communication and Education – that are practised on the African continent, however, need theories. The social sciences generally in practice in Africa, including famous names such as Samir Amin, Valentin Mudimbe, Souleymane Bachir Diagne and Achille Mbembe, would have achieved little in the course of their journeys, were it not for the development of systems capable of understanding their varied subjects, or without the

elaboration of concepts that today allow us to understand the human world from new angles. Theoretical construction, therefore, is a fundamental step in the production of knowledge, the direction of research and reflection on various problems in the social and human sciences.

Today we are witnessing an unprecedented acceleration of mutations on a planetary scale, mutations that affect our daily lives in every conceivable way. There is a whole set of major challenges facing actors and institutions responsible for producing “historicising discourses”, said Ibrahima Thioub (2008/2009), among which is the no small and important task of finding answers informed by the past and the ideas of those great thinkers who preceded us, on contemporary issues.

The novelty that brings new challenges, however, lies in the unprecedented capacity that each person has to produce narratives about the past, about the events that shaped it, as well as about the thoughts that reflected on this same past, and to disseminate them on a planetary scale.

Cabralian studies, as they have been called (Neves, 2017), are certainly part of this new world and the new possibilities that have opened up in terms of the dissemination of ideas. Thus, new fields of study about and based on the thought of Amílcar Cabral are open. What Reiland Rabaka tells us about Cabral's thought becomes relevant, namely that his theoretical-strategic framework is extremely useful for critical theorists who are concerned not only with colonialism, neo-colonialism and postcolonialism, but also with racism, critical race theory, revolutionary nationalism, revolutionary humanism, re-Africanisation, the critique of capitalism and the class struggle in contemporary societies. Its theoretical-strategic framework effectively offers critical concepts and innovative analytical categories, and a wide range of principles and perspectives that make the character of colonialism, capitalism and racism, which are constantly changing, intelligible (Rabaka, 2013). From this perspective, the creation, in Bissau, of an Amílcar Cabral chair at the university that bears his name, the first and only public university in the country, would make perfect sense.

As we know, theory occupied an important place in Cabral's political praxis. He always found it important to link revolutionary practice to revolutionary theory. In fact, he had a habit of saying that “practice makes theory fruitful” and from there he went on to defend the need to “think in order to act and act in order to think better”. Many scholars have highlighted this stance of Cabral. For example, for Lars Rudebeck, among the prominent figures in the history of modern Africa, Cabral was indeed unique in his ability to integrate political theory and practice into a coherent whole by combining, as he did, the elements of classical

Marxism with neo-Marxist dependency theory in an original analysis of social reality and skilfully apply this symbiosis to the concrete mission of decolonising his homeland (Rudebeck, 2012). According to Amady Dieng, “Amílcar Cabral was, without a doubt, one of the few African leaders who theorised his political actions. This is of immense merit for a political leader who focuses on serious social problems” (Dieng, 2005).

The meta-analysis of Cabral’s thought should be interested, however, not only in the more theoretical texts, but in all other forms of expression or manifestation of thought by those who have published work about him, such as photography, cinema, poetry and music, in particular rap music, as has in fact been happening. An example of this is the article by Miguel de Barros and Redy Lima, in which the authors analyse how young Guineans and Cape Verdeans recontextualised the pan-Africanist and nationalist discourse of Amílcar Cabral in the new context of the two countries using rap (Barros & Lima, 2012).

Towards a meta-analysis of Cabral’s thought

The challenges of a meta-analytical approach to A. Cabral’s thought

A meta-analysis of Cabral’s thought is complex not only because of the variety of subjects he addressed (Colonialism, Neo-colonialism and Imperialism, Marxism, Nationalism, Humanism, History, Culture and National Liberation), but also because of the close connection between Amílcar Cabral, the PAIGC and the struggle for liberation of the people of Guinea and Cape Verde. In this article, we have decided to focus on two themes that are essential to Cabral’s thought: culture and development.

On the other hand, due to this interconnection, some studies have dealt with these different subjects at the same time. In a recent introductory article to a thematic dossier on the history of the struggle for liberation and the ideology of Amílcar Cabral, two researchers suggested ideas that confirm our reading and that are of great value within the framework of our approach (Santos & Barros, 2020). Under the title “Amílcar Cabral and the ideology of the anti-colonial revolution”, Aurora Almada e Santos and Víctor Barros argued that we should bring to the debate the problem of how the narratives of struggles and liberation have been read, not only in Guinea, but also in Portuguese-speaking African Countries (PALOP), and in Sub-Saharan Africa, with Cabral at the epicentre. They began by noting, and rightly so, that the first contributions on the subject appeared when the struggle for liberation was still happening.

According to Aurora Almada e Santos and Víctor Barros, a review of the most recent literature on the PAIGC's struggle for independence and the contributions of Amílcar Cabral show that the subject has been viewed in academic studies from the perspective of intellectual history and African critical theory. Scholars who take this position tend to frame Cabral's intellectual life within the context of the black radical tradition and to draw parallels with thinkers such as Aimé Césaire, Cheikh Anta Diop, Chinua Achebe, Frantz Fanon, Kwame Nkrumah, Léopold Senghor, W.E.B. du Bois, and other political and intellectual figures from Africa, Pan-Africanism and the diaspora (Santos & Barros, 2020). Among these authors, and from what we have been able to gather from our own readings, Reiland Rabaka can indeed be included in this tendency, as is evident from her book entitled *Concepts of Cabralism: Amilcar Cabral and African critical theory*, where he analyses Cabral's theories and practices, as well as the various antecedents and main influences on the evolution of his radical politics and critical social theory. Reiland Rabaka's main concern is Cabral's theoretical and political legacies – that is, with the ways in which he constructed, deconstructed and reconstructed theory and the goals, objectives and concrete results of his theoretical applications and discursive practices. But what Santos and Barros give us is not really a meta-analysis of Cabral's ideas, in the sense in which we understand them in this context. Nor was it their intention to do so. For this reason, they do not compare what the various authors have written about Cabral, but rather they produce a fairly exhaustive and meritorious survey of the themes and perspectives that each one favoured, regrouping them into specific themes. In our view, the next step was missing, which was to compare what each person wrote about their chosen topic.

In *Amílcar Cabral: Revolutionary leadership and the people's war*, Patrick Chabal (2002) begins an exercise of this kind, which does not focus on Cabral's thought in general, but rather on the place reserved for certain aspects of his biography. Patrick Chabal was interested in a biographical representation of Amílcar Cabral as a man of action, in contrast with the opinion of authors such as Ronald Chilcote who, when examining the top leader of the PAIGC, had emphasised his singularity and the principle of unity in his thought. The truth is that ever since then, a substantial body of literature has continued to grow focussing on Cabral's political thought, as well as on his capabilities and achievements as a military leader and international diplomat (Gruffydd Jones, 2020). Drawing particularly on the archives of Amílcar Cabral and Mário Pinto de Andrade, Gruffydd Jones explores the development of a Cabralian strand of political thought on culture, race, colonialism and liberation, examining the writings of Cabral and his fellow

activists. She attempts to situate the development of Cabral's thought in its continental and global context.

Although Patrick Chabal considered that Cabral's writings "were essentially analyses of the events in which he was involved; they were not theories or enquiries into abstract social or political questions", others have examined his political thought, especially in relation to Marxism and his work as an agronomist. More recently, Reiland Rabaka has situated Cabral's thought in the tradition of "African critical theory". Patrick Chabal expressed reservations about analyses such as those of Ronald Chilcote, a North American researcher who in 1968 published, in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, an article significantly entitled "The political thought of Amílcar Cabral". For Chabal (1983, p. 167), works such as Chilcote's are flawed as they tend to force a heterogeneous body of texts – such as those written by Cabral in different circumstances and with different purposes – into a principle of unity. As we see it, Chabal did not delve deeper into this discussion with Ronald Chilcote, as this was not the objective of his study.

In fact, Chabal begins the chapter on Cabral's social and political thought by peremptorily stating that "Cabral was primarily a man of action". According to Chabal, Amílcar Cabral's political leadership is better understood if we look more at what he did and less at what he said. Chabal rightly notes that Cabral's writings were essentially analyses of the events in which he was involved. Indeed, they were not theories or investigations into abstract social or political issues. He did not consider himself to be a political theorist, although his writings obviously have theoretical relevance. Chabal is of the opinion that "most of his writings are partisan documents and reflect the very specific purpose and audience for which they were intended" (Chabal, 2002, p. 167). Therefore, Patrick Chabal considers that it is neither useful nor legitimate to claim, as some analysts have done, that Cabral's writings "form a systematic or self-sufficient body of ideas, although they have been very influential in Africa and elsewhere" (Chabal, 2002, p. 167).

He concludes by saying that "Today there are more commentaries on his thought than analysis of his role as a political leader" (Chabal 2002, p. 167). This opinion of Patrick Chabal does not seem to be shared, however, by one of Amílcar Cabral's most renowned biographers, the Guinean historian Julião Soares Sousa, who, in our view, sees Cabral more as a man of action, a politician and a revolutionary, than a theoretician. In the final notes of his work, the author implies this by highlighting the fact that he wanted to write about Cabral from the perspective of an "individual-actor" (Sousa, 2016, p. 571).

However, even those who see Cabral as a man of action, a strategist or a pedagogue do not fail to recognise the scope of his theoretical contributions, to the

point of considering him a social scientist (Pereira, 2016, p. 66), which is precisely what interests us in this reflection. Regarding this, as it is impossible to be exhaustive, we would like to bring up just a few examples or aspects addressed by certain authors who became known for their familiarity with Amílcar Cabral's thought.

From this debate, at least two important themes or aspects have emerged on which a meta-analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thought could focus. The first concerns the basis, scope, character and uniqueness – or not – of his thought, as we have just seen. The second concerns everything that could be subsumed under the theme of development, which in turn encompasses subthemes such as the state, the peasant classes, the relationship between the two, agriculture, social structure, etc.

Some meta-analytical approaches to Cabral's thought

In a paper published in 1986 entitled "Amílcar Cabral and rural transformation in Guinea-Bissau: A preliminary critique", Rosemary Galli attempts to come closer to Amílcar Cabral's concept of development. It analyses rural development policy in Guinea-Bissau and sheds light on the challenges faced by the state in mobilising the peasant classes for development. It concludes that, despite the existence of successful rural development projects, the state has difficulty in effectively involving the peasants. Although she recognises that Cabral cannot be held responsible for the policies practised by the post-colonial state and that no relationship can be established between his ideas and rural development projects, Galli feels that Amílcar Cabral did influence the government and the PAIGC in the post-independence period and is a rich resource of revolutionary theory for the whole of Africa (Galli, 1986, p. 55). His idealistic concept for the role of the state, Galli argues, emphasised state responsibility in development. Galli clarifies that in his early writings, Cabral tried to relate the material problems he encountered with social structures or vice versa. This led to a rather simplified view of peasant classes and helps to explain their inability to properly appreciate the state's relationship to peasants. She argues, for this reason, that Cabral ignored the crucial power dynamics between the state and the Guinean peasants (Galli, 1986, p. 57). The two projects analysed by Galli revealed, according to her, a certain dependence of the peasants on the state. While, on the one hand, the government's development policies had positive effects, on the other hand, they led to a dependence on state support.

More recently, Carlos Cardoso (2005) set out to revisit the concept of development in Cabral's thought, which he considers to be one of the least explored

facets of Amílcar Cabral's theoretical legacy. According to Cardoso, scholars and biographers of this great African thinker (Mário de Andrade, 1980, Patrick Chabal, 1981, Ronald Chilcote, 1991), concentrated their analysis essentially on the political, social and cultural aspects of his work. The exceptions are the works of Ronald Chilcote and Lars Rudebeck. In various studies, the two dealt with different aspects related to development issues, as Cabral understood them. In this paper, Carlos Cardoso argues that although not being a Cabral "expert", Rosemary Galli analysed, as illustrated above, Cabral's ideas regarding rural transformation in Guinea-Bissau, highlighting aspects related to his concept of development.

According to Cardoso, Amílcar Cabral contributed significantly to the understanding of the social and economic development of African peoples (Cardoso, 2005). Although most studies of his work have focused on the political, social and cultural aspects, Cardoso argues that Cabral also left fragments that address economic and social issues. Cabral analysed the social structure of Guinea and Cabo Verde, highlighting the role of the peasants and the petite bourgeoisie in the process of development. He recognised the importance of these groups in social and economic transformation and discussed economic resistance during the anti-colonial struggle and how it affected development (Cardoso, 2005). The researcher uses Ronald Chilcote, Cabral's biographer, who described his thinking as a model of "developmental nationalism" (Chilcote, 1968) to show that Cabral was committed to liberation from the colonial yoke, but was also concerned with building a "new" life in the liberated areas (Cardoso, 2005). This author concludes his reflections by emphasising that these contributions by Cabral remain relevant to the debate on African development. His focus on social transformation, economic structure and resistance remains a valuable source of important reflection (Cardoso, 2005). However, Chilcote limits himself to a discussion of the defining aspects without citing an experience that could serve to demonstrate such a concept and without discussing one of the main actors of this development, the peasants, which Rosemary Galli did.

There would appear to be grey areas when it comes to understanding Cabral's writings regarding the role attributed to the peasants in the development of Guinea-Bissau. According to Rosemary Galli, Cabral could never bring himself to give the due weight of significance to the relationship between the peasants and the colonial state. That is to say that he did not see the conservatism of the peasant classes as a form of passive class struggle. Therefore, he underestimated the nature of their subsequent relations with the post-colonial state (Galli, 1986).

Carlos Lopes has no such doubts about the conceptualisation of the peasant classes within the framework of Guinean social formation, as he admits that for Cabral the peasant mass is not revolutionary, although the revolution cannot be carried out without its support. According to him, the PAIGC had to persuade the peasants to fight with specific and direct methods, which is why it is necessary to make a distinction between physical force and revolutionary force. The first would be faced by the peasants, while the second was never definitively defined by Cabral (Lopes, 1984). This debate deserves to be revisited in light of what is happening in relation to public policies implemented in the area of rural development in Guinea-Bissau. But, as we said above, one of the difficulties of a meta-analysis of Cabral's thought lies in the diversity of the subjects he addressed.

In his article entitled "Ideology, science and people in Amílcar Cabral", José Neves (2017) attempts to approach Cabral's thought by contrasting what he considers to be Chabal's anti-Marxist positivism and Mário de Andrade's positivist Marxism in relation to the notion of ideology and science, among other ways. He also discusses Pablo Luke Idahosa's concept of the dialectic between political-ideological motivation and scientific motivation in the advancement of scientific work. José Neves says that he distances himself from the interpretations of Patrick Chabal and Mário Pinto de Andrade, as well as from the interpretation of Pablo Luke Idahosa. And, without downplaying the value of numerous empirical and analytical facets the work of these authors offers, he suggests we place Cabral's scientific work within the framework of both a history of science and a history of political ideologies.

As for us, alongside what we have argued regarding the need for a new approach to Cabral's thought with a view to going deeper into it, three areas stand out where his thought has not been properly explored, or research has only just begun:

- Leadership, voluntarism and political will;
- Humanistics;
- Development studies.

As mentioned above, few authors have devoted any attention to what I have come to call the concept of development in Amílcar Cabral's thought. Carlos Schwarz's work gives us some clues, aspects or facets of Cabral's thought that can be explored, and which he summarises under the subtitle "The struggle for independence as an integrated development programme". More than a decade earlier, Rosemary Galli also made inroads into Cabral's thinking on the development of agriculture, including agricultural techniques. Galli even went so far as

to contrast Cabral's concept with those of some colonial authors such as Picado Horta and José Luís Ferreira Mendes (Galli & Jones, 1987), particularly with regard to the concept of development itself. Among other aspects, Galli posits that Picado Horta argued that colonialism had not yet had a significant impact on Guinean agricultural development because it had not invested in infrastructure or capitalist enterprises. For Cabral, Galli notes, colonialism had had a negative impact, under-developing rather than developing traditional agriculture (Galli & Jones, 1987, p. 49). But both were of the opinion that appropriate state investment and guidance could integrate the peasant classes into modern society – in a capitalist state for Picado Horta, a socialist state for Cabral.

Carlos Schwarz highlights, among other aspects, the fact that Amílcar Cabral opted for the gradual involvement of the peasants in revolutionary action, as the protagonists acquired skills and knowledge, without ever rushing to accelerate the pace of execution. He ended up breaking away from rural militants (Schwarz, 2013).

Today, we also know, due to Frederico Ágoas' recent work on the history of sociology in Portugal, that agrarian studies were one of the origins of the subject of sociology in Portugal. Throughout the 20th century, including the dictatorial period, some of these studies at first went from being about agricultural management to carrying out analyses of what is now considered political economics. Later, this developed into subjects such as agrarian geography and rural sociology (Ágoas, 2010, p. 199).

We can even say that this tendency to turn part of agrarian knowledge into an area of sociology somehow manifested itself in Cabral's scientific career. This is immediately visible in the monographic study he carried out as his final undergraduate work. This study saw a turning point in the field of pedology, including ecological concerns, with the latter being understood here not only as attention to the land, flora and fauna, but also to men and their social relations. It would therefore seem that Cabral's paper and his agrarian studies somehow participated in a broader process of sociologisation of agronomy. In other words, according to the agronomic point of view adopted by Cabral, it would be necessary to look not only at issues that we could consider to be of a strictly natural nature, but also at human and social variants of this nature, consequently proposing the technical qualification of individuals and the modelling of the agrarian structure to local specificities.

In an article published in 2018, Filipa César provides us with an interesting analysis of the connection between the study of the Earth or agronomy, and sociological studies in Cabral's thought, emphasising the point that Cabral was

prescient when he said, “We can affirm, without fear of contradiction... that defending the Earth is the most effective process to defend Humanity”, and that from this point of view “Cabral was ahead of his time” (César, 2018, pp. 255/6). According to César, Cabral’s understanding of soil and erosion is not dissociable from his project of liberation struggle. His reports on colonial land exploitation and the commercial economy, together with his research on soil and erosion, reveal his dual role as state soil scientist and as the “sower” of African liberation. According to her, Cabral understood agronomy not only as a discipline that combines geology, soil science, agriculture, biology and economics, but as a means of obtaining concrete knowledge about the living conditions of people in the colonies (César, 2018). Indeed, as a young agronomy student, Cabral carried out research in Cuba, a flat, dry area in the south of Portugal that was economically disadvantaged. This gave him an early insight into the importance of linking militant knowledge to theory. The scientific data that Cabral collected during his work as an agronomist became instrumental in the theoretical and political arguments that denounced the injustice committed on the land ruled by the colonial powers, and later, in its military strategy. Soil care was crucial for Cabral as part of the recovery work (of the soil and more), necessary in the project of national reconstruction in the post-colonial period. Reading the “people” as “mountains” in the context of colonial extraction, oppression and exploitation, highlights a visionary understanding of the Capitalocene condition of the Earth’s surface (César, 2018).

Despite evocations and sporadic citations in academic work, Amílcar Cabral’s contribution to scientific studies in both the fields of agricultural sciences and social sciences has not been sufficiently recognised and has been much less valued. In short, it can be said that Cabral left an invaluable legacy in these and other areas of knowledge and that, once highlighted, they are likely to contribute to the advancement of what has come to be called development studies. His analysis of the social structure of Guinean and Cabo Verdean societies in the colonial era, the role of culture in the struggle for national liberation, as well as the role of the petite bourgeoisie are theoretical contributions of great value in the field of sociology, in the same way that the agrarian studies carried out within the framework of the agricultural census during the 1950s represent an invaluable contribution to the knowledge of the structure and dynamics of agricultural production in Guinea-Bissau.

Coming to a conclusion

In addition to the laudable initiatives aimed at the preservation of Amílcar Cabral's memory, work must be done to deepen our understanding of his theoretical legacy to perpetuate it. The approach must, however, find innovative ways to develop the scientific legacy of this great thinker, which involves, for example, the creation of an Amílcar Cabral chair in Guinea-Bissau, similar to what has happened in certain academic institutions, such as the University of Cabo Verde. Initiatives of this nature can contribute greatly to such a goal, avoiding at least one of the various potential pitfalls: the temptation to shape Cabral's variety of texts into a tidy body of work, as partly happens in the approaches that accentuate his theoretical side, running the risk of moulding him into the image of an author – and one ready to be accepted into the cannon as if the vicissitudes of the militant practice that marked his path could be ignored. Meta-analysis, being a synthesis of previous research on a subject, a paradigm from which the researcher adopts a new approach by gathering results and conclusions from others, and as a method that has proven itself in other scientific areas, can contribute to elevating the analysis of Amílcar Cabral's thinking to another level.

References

- Ágoas, F. (2010). Povo, população e sociedade na investigação económica-agrária do início do século XX. In J. Neves (Org.), *Como se faz um povo: Ensaios para a história do Portugal contemporâneo* (pp. 293-310). Tinta-da-China.
- Andrade, M. P. de. (1980). *Amilcar Cabral: Essai de biographie politique*. Maspero.
- Barros, M. de, & Lima, R. W. (2012). Rap Kriol(U): O pan-africanismo de Cabral na música de intervenção juvenil na Guiné-Bissau e em Cabo Verde. *REALIS – Revista de Estudos AntiUtilitaristas e Pós-coloniais*, 2(2), 89-117.
- Cardoso, C. (2005). Revisitando o conceito de desenvolvimento no pensamento de Amílcar Cabral. http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/Carlos_Cardoso-2.pdf
- César, F. (2018). Meteorisations. *Third Text*, 32(2-3), 254-272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2018.1492073>
- Chabal, P. (1981). National liberation in Portuguese Guinea, 1956-1974. *African Affairs*, 80(318), 75-99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.afraf.a097302>
- Chabal, P. (1983). *Amílcar Cabral: Revolutionary leadership and people's war*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chabal, P. (2002). *Amílcar Cabral: Revolutionary leadership and people's war*. C. Hurst & Co. (Original work published in 1983)
- Chilcote, R. (1968). The political thought of Amílcar Cabral. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 6(3), 373-388.
- Chilcote, R. (1991). *Amilcar Cabral's revolutionary theory and practice: A critical guide*. Lynne Rienner.
- Dieng, A. A. (2005). A contribuição teórica de Amílcar Cabral. In *Cabral no cruzamento de épocas*. Communications and speeches produced at the II Amílcar Cabral International Symposium. Amílcar Cabral Foundation, in partnership with CODESRIA and the Mário Soares Foundation, Praia.
- Galli, R. (1986). Amilcar Cabral and rural transformation in Guinea-Bissau: A preliminary critique. *Rural Africana*, 25-26, pp. 55-73.
- Galli, R., & Jones, J. (1987). *Guinea-Bissau. Politics, economics and society*. Frances Pinter/Lynne Rienner.
- Gruffydd Jones, B. (2020). Race, culture and liberation: African anticolonial thought and practice in the time of decolonisation. *The International History Review*, 42(6), 1238-1256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2019.1695138>
- Havik, P. (2016). Guinea-Bissau's rural economy and society: A reassessment of colonial and postcolonial dynamics. In P. Chabal & T. Green (Eds.), *Guinea-Bissau: Micro-state to 'narco-state'* (pp. 55-79). Hurst & Company.
- Lopes, C. (1984). As dominantes teóricas no pensamento de Amílcar Cabral. *Revista Internacional de Estudos Africanos*, 2, pp. 63-91.
- Luiz, A. J. B. (2002). Meta-análise: Definição, aplicações e sinergia com dados espaciais. *Cadernos de Ciência & Tecnologia*, 19(3), 407-428.
- Manji, F., & Fletcher Jr., B. (2013). *Claim no easy victories: The legacy of Amílcar Cabral*. CODESRIA & Daraja Press.
- Mendy, P. K. (2019). *Amilcar Cabral. A nationalist and Pan-Africanist revolutionary*. Ohio University Press (Série "Ohio Short Histories for Africa").

- Neves, J. (2017). Ideologia, ciência e povo em Amílcar Cabral. *História, Ciências, Saúde – Manguinhos*, 24(2), 333-347.
- Neves, J., & Pires Martins, L. (2023). *Amílcar Cabral, uma exposição*. Iniciativa da Comissão Comemorativa 50 anos 25 de Abril, Palácio Baldaya, março-junho de 2023, Lisboa.
- Pereira, D. (2016). Amílcar Cabral: Da atualidade do seu pensamento – uma outra opinião. In *Por Cabral sempre. Forum Amílcar Cabral. Comunicações e Discursos*. Fundação Amílcar Cabral - Praia.
- Rabaka, R. (2013). Amílcar Cabral and Africana critical theory. In F. Manji & B. Fletcher Jr. (Eds.), *Claim no easy victories. The legacy of Amílcar Cabral*. CODESRIA & Daraja Press.
- Rabaka, R. (2014). *Concepts of Cabralism: Amílcar Cabral and Africana critical theory*. Critical Africana Studies, Lexington Books.
- Rolim, G. K. (2016). Revolução e cultura no pensamento de Frantz Fanon e Amílcar Cabral. In J. Rivaís Macedo (Org.), *O pensamento africano no século XX* (pp. 167-198). Expressão Popular.
- Rudebeck, L. (2012). Uma interpretação das teorias de Cabral sobre a democracia. In C. Lopes (Org.), *Desafios contemporâneos da África. O legado de Amílcar Cabral* (pp. 133-145) (R. Leal, Tr.). UNESP.
- Santos, A. A., & Barros, V. (2020). Introduction. Amílcar Cabral and the idea of anticolonial revolution. *Lusotopie* [Online], 19(1). <http://journals.openedition.org/lusotopie/4502>
- Schwarz, C. (2013). Amílcar Cabral, um agrônomo antes do seu tempo. Artigo publicado pela primeira vez no site da Aliança para o Desenvolvimento (AD), Bissau.
- Sousa, J. S. (2016). *Amílcar Cabral (1924-1973). Vida e morte de um revolucionário africano*. Author. Tipografia Lousanense. (Original work published in 2011)
- Thioub, I. (2008/2009). De l'écriture à l'enseignement de l'histoire (Édito). *PHARE, Patrimoine & Histoire en Afrique: Recherches & Expériences*, 3.