

## Gloomy Situation in FRELIMO

Uria T. Simango

*Excerpts from the paper issued on 30 November 1969  
by Uria T. Simango, then a member of the  
Presidential Council of FRELIMO.*

There are people in the organisation who tend to give/develop a theory that there are two groups in the organisation, one led by Dr. Mondlane and the other by Uria Simango. I refute this theory and say that there is one group, the first one. Events below described will prove this to be true. However it should be said that there are many people in the party who think that some of our policies are not correct. Such people do not constitute an organised group against anybody, but whenever they are informed of such bad policies they say their opinion. It is possible that they may be two or more who do not agree with certain decisions at the same time. Problems which divided the Central Committee are such as the Mozambique Institute which some maintained an opinion that it should be directed and controlled by FRELIMO and others sustained that it should be independent. Because the first group was right – the Institute was nationalised in 1968, when FRELIMO for the first time had the prerogative to appoint the Principal of the Secondary School. However there are distortions of decisions about the Mozambique Institute and there are certain things which still need to be settled. How finally these problems will be resolved is still a question mark.

There is a swing to say that we are divided on ideology. This can only mean difference on economic, religious, social policies (class), etc. I agree that ideology is very important but it should never be considered as a uniting or dividing factor of the nationalist liberation forces of Mozambique at this stage, if all agree and accept fundamental principles: a) liberate Mozambique from the Portuguese colonial domination and b) through the armed struggle. Our struggle today is not principally an ideological or class one; it is a struggle of masses of people against foreign domination, Portuguese colonialist, for freedom and independence of these masses. The question of scientific socialism and capitalism in Mozambique should not be allowed to divide us if it becomes a must, of course at a later stage of the struggle. This should not be interpreted to mean that we should allow or develop a bourgeois or capitalist oriented group in FRELIMO, for our objective is to emancipate our people completely . . . this is our commitment. Whether people with religious backgrounds should participate in the administration of the country is a problem that will be seen later too. It is wrong to say that we are implanting socialism in the country; to say so only reveals our ignorance of what socialism is. To say that we are not building socialism now does not mean that we may not in the future realise it. Therefore if there is an indigenous bourgeois class at the moment and if it is willing to contribute for the liberation of the country we must accept its cooperation because since our struggle is divided in various stages, the first stage is a liberation one by a national liberation

movement by all the people without discrimination based on sex, creed, wealthy condition, etc. Fortunately enough there is no indigenous bourgeois class to contend with. On the other hand, we are not yet strong enough to fight the Portuguese and their allies and at the same time wage a war against a national bourgeois class. If they (the bourgeoisie) existed we would rally them to fight with us against the common enemy. Within the organisation, certainly we must fight all forms of corruption, reactionalism and bourgeoisie, using our machinery of political education. It therefore becomes ridiculous to waste our energy to a point of destroying our unity by fighting a pretended enemy, a bourgeois class, with an intention to impress somebody, if there is anybody who can be impressed. . . .

Towards the end of February and beginning of March this year, after the death of Dr. Mondlane, late President of FRELIMO, several people from the southern region of our country, amongst them Samora Moises Machel, Joaquim Chissano, Marcelino dos Santos, Armando Guebuza, Aurelio Manave, Josina Abiatar Muthemba, Eugenio Mondlane and Francisco Sumbane, held several meetings at Janet Rae Mondlane's house at Oyster Bay. She also took part in the meetings. They studied the circumstances surrounding Dr. Mondlane's death as a person from their tribe, as to who had killed him. Janet told the meeting that Filipe Magaia, Sansao Muthemba and Dr. Mondlane had been killed by the people of the north (from Beira to Ruyme river) because they are against us of the south. She was corrected by reference to the death of Magaia, being told that he was killed by a person from the south and not from the north. They also discussed how they could defend for and safeguard the interests of the people of the south,

The meetings concluded that Uria Simango, Silverio Mungu, Mariano Masinye and Samuel Dhlakama were their enemies, were responsible for Dr. Mondlane's death and should therefore be eliminated. This decision was criticised by two elderly men, Francisco Sumbane and Eugenio Mondlane, cousin of the deceased. They insisted that they should all cooperate and work with Simango; the contrary would be tribalism. Their advice was not given heed.

What happened in Mozambique is just a fulfilment of the plan drawn and decision taken at Janet's house at Oyster Bay by the clique of criminals in obedience to the imperialist plan, which they considered to be capable of satisfying their interest too. All those who participated in the meetings, are responsible for Mungu's cruel death, their hands are bloody, they are criminals. They are also responsible for many unnecessary executions of fighters and people. They must bear the responsibility for the most desertions and present situation of our movement.

We cannot say 'Let bygones be bygones'; those responsible for these crimes should bear the responsibility on their shoulders, the uncommitted to work for the imperialists must defend the lives of the fighters and of the people and their rights and interests.

As I have said above, personally I cannot agree to be part of crimes against our people. Only with radical and complete change of such a situation can I

feel morally able to cooperate; otherwise it is an honour to dissociate myself from the actions of the criminals for you cannot trust them, they are vipers — tools of imperialism.