

BOOK REVIEWS

KWAME NKRUMAH, *Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, London & Edinburgh, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1965, xx+280 pp.

If we were to consider this work as a scholarly study of neo-colonialism it would no doubt be possible to draw attention to a number of excellent aspects and also to some deficiencies. However, to read this book in such a way would not allow for a full appreciation of its significance. This is because rather than being read as a scholarly study this book is of such a nature that it should be read as an expression of the living thought of a living politician who until recently was one of the greatest leaders of African nationalism and who has also exercised an important influence in world politics.

What is to be noted in it is that in spite of his fierce hatred and censure of neo-colonialism Nkrumah does not advocate the extirpation of the capitalism which forms the basis of neo-colonialism. He merely says that if Africa can unite to meet the situation, "faced with a new situation, those who practise neo-colonialism would adjust themselves to this new balance of world forces in exactly the same way as the capitalist world has in the past adjusted itself to any other change in the balance of power." (p. 259) We can clearly find in him influence from the Chinese Communist Party's "Revolutionary General Line" when he insists that "at present an international class struggle is being fought between the imperialist and developing countries." There is, however, a fundamental difference between the ideologies of the Chinese Communist Party and him. The Chinese Communist Party aims at a world communist revolution. Nkrumah, on the contrary, has no idea of it at all. He once professed that he was a nonconformist Christian and Marxist. It can be said, however, from reading this book that he is not a Marxist, in spite of his expression of the highest esteem to Marx. His aim is not the abolition of imperialism, but that of amending the present unfair relations between the industrial countries and Africa to the advantage of the Africans by means of pressure that could be exercised by African solidarity. Aid from capitalist countries will also be welcome in so far as it coincides with the interests of Africa. He even maintains that fair aid to the non-alignment nations is more to the advantage of the advanced countries than aid to unstable neo-colonial countries. We may say that in this we can see the original nature of non-alignment policy revealed most strikingly. The content of the "socialism" envisaged by Nkrumah, too, means no more than a planned economy centred on state enterprises, and such is the nature of his "African socialism" that it may well be called state capitalism enlarged to cover the African Continent.

We may say that, like his other works, this book contains within itself

the significance and the limitations attaching to "Nkrumahism" as a form of radical African nationalism. Nkrumah's ideology as revealed in these works has been evaluated by some as realistic, and by others as a dangerous tight-rope act. We may say that his fall from power by the coup d'état on the 24th of February, 1966, has focused attention on the significance and limitations of Nkrumahism in a dramatic manner.

Nkrumah, who with abounding self-confidence and pride bore testimony to the African's capacity for independence in *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* (1957), written immediately after Ghana's attainment of independence, soon became acutely aware that the direction in which he aimed to travel was filled with distress and difficulty, and in the fourth year following the independence he felt obliged to write a second work, *I Speak of Freedom* (1961), in which he pleaded the difficulties attendant upon the building-up of the nation. In addition to this, and in order to bring forth the methods to be employed in fulfilling the task at hand, he expounded the urgency of African unity in *Africa Must Unite* (1963) and carried out the theoretical grounding of African socialism in *Consciencism* (1964). In spite of this, however, the realities of Africa have not always taken the direction for which he hoped. Among other things, the unification of Africa which Nkrumah never ceased to advocate has shown no great advance. What is more, political conditions in the African nations have not been stable, and right-ward coups d'état have followed one another. In Nkrumah's eyes all these difficulties have been due to the machinations of the new colonialism. As stated in the dedication, this book has been written for "the Freedom Fighters of Africa living and dead."

According to the author, "The essence of neo-colonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside." (p. ix) This is to say that the neo-colonial country is nominally independent but is not an independent country in substance. The point which is characteristic in this definition is that the essence of neo-colonialism is sought only in the methods and forms of political control found therein, and it is not seen as a phenomenon essential to the specific historical period of the collapse of the colonial system after the Second World War. According to Nkrumah neo-colonialism can be found in the 19th century, and at present old-fashioned colonialism still remains the problem of Africa. All that has happened is that as the present-day colonialism is continuing its retreat and in its place neo-colonialism has come on to the stage as "the main instrument of imperialism."

What is the reason? Nkrumah searches for it in the changes in the conditions governing imperialism. According to him three factors, the intensification of competition among the imperialist countries arising from the pursuit of private profit and the unequal development essential to capitalism, the growing strength of the forces of socialism, and the growth of struggles for independence in the colonial hinterlands of capitalism, have been responsible for neo-colonialism having taken the place of colonialism as the main

instrument of imperialism. Now that the advance of science has raised productivity and has increased to an unprecedented degree the necessity of markets for primary resources and surplus capital, imperialism is forced to carry on a war on many fronts. "The outcropping of new States from colonial submergence raised the pivotal problem of how to retain these countries within the colonial relationship once open control was removed. Thus has opened up a new phase in imperialism, that of the adaptation of colonialism to the new condition of the elimination of political overlordship of colonial powers, the phase in which colonialism is to be maintained by other means." (p. 41)

Nkrumah's argumentation is clearly based on Marxism, but at the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that it is conditioned by his character as an anti-colonial nationalist. The conditions for the emergence of neo-colonialism to which Nkrumah draws attention come from what Marxists call the factors of the general crisis of capitalism, but in Marxism, as is well known, another factor is mentioned in addition to those mentioned by him—the factor of the upsurge of the class struggle inside the imperialist countries. On this point Nkrumah sets forth a view of his own. He does not regard the working classes of the imperialist countries as forces opposed to neo-colonialism. He expresses distrust of the imperialist nations in their entirety, including their working classes. He holds that neo-colonialism, like old-fashioned colonialism, is an attempt to "export" the internal disputes of capitalism. In particular Nkrumah passes censure by saying that since the war even the leaders of the working classes have consciously made use of the method of employing colonial profits in building up "the welfare state" in order to save their working classes from mass unemployment and low standards of living. Lenin early drew attention to the buying-over of the labour aristocracy with the help of colonial surplus profits, and the author carries this point still further. According to him the fact of the matter is that at present day an international class struggle is being fought between the industrial countries which are waxing fatter and fatter, and the underdeveloped which are getting poorer and poorer.

Nkrumah maintains that the neo-colonialism of the present day is the final stage of imperialism. This is because only when neo-colonialism has been extirpated will monopoly capitalism be forced into a head-on clash with the working class in each of the monopoly capitalist countries, whereupon the liquidation of imperialism will be completed. According to the author this is also the stage at which imperialism is most dangerous. This is because neo-colonialism constitutes a hot-bed for "limited wars." As a result of the development of nuclear weapons limited wars alone are now possible. However, it is in the case of small nations where a decisive effect can be produced by a landing of a few thousand marines or by financing mercenaries that a limited war is possible. Acting on the basis of its principle of "divide and rule" neo-colonialism obstructs the formation of large national state units which would render limited wars impossible. Once a limited war has

been started it always contains the possibility of eventually enlarging itself into a world war. According to Nkrumah neo-colonialism is also the worst form of imperialism. For those who run it neo-colonialism means power without responsibility, and for those who suffer under it it means exploitation without recompense. In the age of the old-fashioned colonialism the imperial power at least had to explain and justify their conduct overseas at home, and the people of the colonies could expect to receive protection against acts of violence from the foreign countries. Neither of these can be looked for under neo-colonialism.

Regarding the mechanisms of neo-colonialism the author differs little from the accounts given by previous commentators on this subject. One point, however, to which attention is directed in this book is that stress is laid on the fact that Balkanization is the basic characteristic of all the methods employed by neo-colonialism. We can thus see here, too, the idea that the chief cause of the inability to realize the author's ideal of the unification of Africa is to be found in the obstruction committed by neo-colonialism. Another point is found in the statement that among the most evil methods resorted to by neo-colonialists are the assassination of the best nationalist leaders and their expulsion by coup d'état. The author may perhaps have written this with the murder of Lumumba in mind, at a time when he still occupied the position of President of Ghana.

The greater part of this book is devoted to a description of the actual state of economic control which the great international monopoly made up by America, Britain, France, Belgium, Western Germany, and other nations has spread over Africa and practically the whole of the capitalist world, and this is the most vivid aspect of the book. The "Oppenheimer Empire" is cited as a typical example of this kind of monopoly capital. In association with Morgan and Dupont and the company which achieved an evil reputation in the Congo, Union Minières, as well as with other great financial cliques and great enterprises, it forms what may justly be called a great international monopoly. The Oppenheimer Empire is only one example of imperialist exploitation. The author gives painstaking descriptions of many other instances of neo-colonialist exploitation and says that Africa has become the "playground" of such neo-colonialism. However, since neo-colonialism is not a sign of the strength of imperialism but rather of its hideous gasp, Nkrumah maintains that the overcoming of neo-colonialism is possible. However, neo-colonialism cannot be overthrown by standing idly by, or merely engaging in debate. None of the imperialists will abandon neo-colonialism unless pressure is brought to bear on them which will be sufficient to leave them no alternative. Action is necessary. Since all the methods employed by neo-colonialism aim at "divide and rule," unity is the first priority for action directed to its destruction. It is necessary to take the solidarity of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as the basis, to seek support from the socialist countries, and to urge on the increase of the anti-colonial forces within the imperialist nations and make use of them. As regards Africa, the setting up of a united African

government and the putting into effect of a socialist planned economy are essential. In particular, as regards African unity, so long as Africa remains split up into a large number of small nations how can Africa offer effective resistance to a great monopoly whose annual budget is greater than that of an African state? The element of time is important. At a time when in addition to the nations already involved the powerful neo-colonial force represented by America is continuing to make headway, Africa must not spend its time in vain. If action is taken before the right time the difficulties will only be that much increased. The economies which can be nurtured taking the small state as the unit will be unable to support themselves, but a planned economy and division of labour on the Continental scale promise Africa's prosperity. Regarding the other advantages attaching to African unity detailed discussion is to be found in the author's other works (for example, in *Africa Must Unite*), but this is repeated in the book under review.

The overcoming of neo-colonialism is necessary not only for the underdeveloped countries of Africa. Since it is only when neo-colonialism has been abolished that mankind will be able to grapple with the dissolution of the danger of world war and the question of world poverty, Nkrumah maintains that this is a task which must be fulfilled by the people of the whole world. (*Keisuke Tanimoto*)

GEORGE ROSEN, *Democracy and Economic Change in India*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1966, xviii+326pp.

This voluminous work is the outcome of George Rosen's ten years' research work on India, three years of which he spent in that country. Several years ago he completed a book on industrial change in India, and since then he has been widely regarded as an established research worker on the economic development of India. In this book, however, he has made an extensive use not only of the existing data on Indian economics, but of the written materials concerning the various aspects of India's political and social structure and change, and has tried to construct a comprehensive picture of the process of change taking place in India. Therefore, in a way, one can take this work as an aggregate of social scientific researches made so far on India, both in and outside that country.

What the author has tried to do through this laborious work is to establish the relationship in India between politics and economics, or more specifically, "between the political environment and economic development" (p. vii), certainly an absorbing and challenging subject to any student of social sciences.

Another characteristic of this book is that Rosen has tried to combine his researches with a presentation of, or at least a set of proposals on, United States policy toward India. This strong consciousness of the policy implications of his work would be understandable, since he has been with the RAND