of capitalism with new social divisions, those of capitalists and wage workers. But the new, native, capitalists found themselves seriously hampered by the restrictions of colonialism and they raised the cry for independence with the usual display of nationalism and patriotism. Africans became united under the banner: "Down with Colonialism and Imperialism" and, in nation after nation, "freedom" was won until today there is very little of the old style colonialism left on the continent. (2)

But the new, native rulers are confronted with very serious economic problems. The African continent has been relatively poor in natural resources. The lure for the colonial powers was, of course, ivory, rubber, sugar, cocoa, diamonds and chemicals. And it appears now that there are workable deposits of bauxite, iron ore, and possibly oil (apart from the oil deposits in North Africa). But when all of this has been noted, Africa still does not compare in natural resources with the vast, untapped reservoirs of raw materials in Asia. The one great exception to this general condition is, of course, Katanga Province in the Congo and the crisis in that country may be directly traced to Katanga's unusually rich resources. For the rest of new Africa, the one great potential for industrial growth lies in the harnessing of its enormous hydro-electric power.

As a consequence of the low development of industry and agriculture the new governments are compelled to concentrate their efforts upon developing modern agricultural methods and new food crops, new industries, new resources, and new sources of power. They must rely heavily on imports to strengthen these efforts while fostering their limited native industrial and agricultural products for export. These limitations have resulted in a native bourgeoisie too weak to govern without the trappings of state capitalism.

As for the workers, so recently removed from the relationships of tribalism, they remain as before "independence," the subject class with new, native, rather than foreign, exploiters.

AFRICAN STATE CAPITALISM

The day when new capitalist nations could develop in the classical fashion have long since passed. In fact the entire period since World War I has been characterized by an onrush of new nations which had to bow to the same historic need — the introduction of state-capitalist regimes — and virtually all of which proceeded to label themselves "socialist" or "communist." The nations of new Africa are no exception.

And so, throughout modern Africa is heard the cry: Plan for economic development! Nkrumah of Ghana, for example, stressed:

> ".... the economic development of the African continent must be planned... only a strong political union can bring about full and effective development of our natural resources for the benefit of our people." (I Speak Of Freedom.)

And in line with this, "planning" in every phase of African activities grows by leaps and bounds. It extends from the channeling of profits from private individuals and foreign imperialists to national investments and the new native bureaucracy, on the one hand, to the spread of government bureaus for health, welfare and other social purposes, on the other. Needless to say, and of highest priority, there is the rapid training of native experts in all the required fields and the spreading of literacy among the population—so essential to capitalism—on all levels from the primary grades to the universities.

In fact, so much emphasis is being placed on the drive for Pan-African state capitalism, as described by Nkrumah, that the new African countries **already** find themselves torn between this need and their own desire for national sovereignty. In this sense, Africa has almost caught up with the countries of Western Europe which are torn between remaining second-rate powers and the advantage of the Common Market — a sort of United States of Europe.

(2) Algeria is now negotiating for its independence. There are only 18 non-independent areas left in Africa: Spain 3, France 2 (including Algeria), Union of South Africa 1 (South-West Africa), Portugal 2, Great Britain 9 (including Uganda), and Belgium 1 (Ruanda-Urundi).

THE NEW COLONIALISM: FOREIGN AID

Despite the great enthusiasm for the new "independence" of African countries, the African continent is still dependent upon and subservient to the highly developed capitalist powers. The Nobel prize winner, Luthuli, deploring the premature independence of the more backward African nations (Congo, in particular) acknowledged that:

> "Africans cannot manage without the whites. We have accepted Western civilization; we like it and are absorbing it as fast as we can."

The more Africa "absorbs Western civilization" (read: capitalism), the more Africans cannot manage without the whites (read: the world market and the major powers).

But the nature of dependency in these times is different from the classical colonialism. In fact the new native states have been aided and abetted by the colonial imperialists, themselves, in breaking down the old, outworn, colonial set-ups which have become hindrances to their effective controls in Africa. There are immense advantages to be derived from the newer types of colonialism, such as the Commonwealth form as exemplified by the British and French Commonwealths. By such means the former colonies are transformed into economic satellites. The real, even though increasingly fragile, capitals of these Commonwealths remain in London and Paris. The recent tour of Queen Elizabeth in Black Africa merely symbolized the allegiances. (3)

Even more effective than the Commonwealth form of colonialism is foreign aid. This "benevolent" guise conceals the real purposes and serves the interests of the two **real** world powers: USSR and U.S.A. Backward countries must come under the yoke of the major powers because of their dire need for aid. And aid without strings does not exist.

In a special article in the N. Y. Times (11-26-61) devoted to the topic: "Strings on Aid?, No, But —" Tom Wicker points out:

> "Thus, when the Kennedy Administration recently held up a final decision on whether to provide $133,000,000 for Ghana's huge Volta River hydro-electric and aluminum-producing project, it did not act simply in retaliation for President Nkrumah's Eastward leaning stance at the Belgrade Conference. Rather, it was regarded as foolhardy and unrealistic to hand such a plum immediately after he had slapped the United States in the face... What was accomplished by the decision to go slow... was to give Mr. Nkrumah more than a hint that he should not take the United States for granted."

And Mr. Wicker sums up his conclusions with the following callousness: "The foreign aid program has to be viewed more clearly in the context of what would **advance American interests.**" (My emphasis.)

The same policy, of course, applies to the Soviet Union's aid program. In the Monthly Review, November 1961, Professor Charles Bettelheim, Russian apologist and chief author of the three-year plan now operating in the Republic of Guinea, says that Africa should only accept "reasonable foreign aid" (the Russian brand) to foster its own capital formation. This Russian counterpart of Mr. Wicker claims to be a Marxist yet ignores the fact that the SOLE source of capital formation is through the exploitation of the workers, domestic and foreign alike.

It is, then, chiefly through the Commonwealth systems and the programs of foreign aid that colonialism is maintained. As for the colonial policies of Portugal and Belgium, they

(3) Britain — not the peoples or the chiefs of the four tribes making up the British Protectorate of Uganda — announced the plans for Uganda independence in 1962. Many of the arrangements were made with "King Freddie" of Buganda and the London night clubs. (See Time Magazine, 10-20-61).