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Abstract

The hero of African decolonisation and the first black post-colonialist leader, Kwame Nkrumah, studied in both countries the United States of America (USA) and Britain as well as visited most of Western nations. While he targeted the colonial empires like the United Kingdom (UK) during decolonisation, he also attacked the USA for the post-independence problems which he termed neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is, for Nkrumah, the colonialists’ switch of tactics when encountered with challenges from their colonies. They adopt policies for aid programmes and slogans of freedom in order to perpetuate colonisation. In short, it is the modern phase of imperialism. However those colonial countries were themselves under the spell of USA neo-liberal capitalism. According to Nkrumah, USA played catalyst between colonisers and colonised during decolonisation in order to reach its Neo-colonialist status. Thus, Nkrumah has written *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* in 1965 to denounce this US neo-liberal capitalism which is itself a major constituent of today globalisation. Purposely, this Mémoire attempts to analyse this book of Nkrumah in the light of globalisation to confirm that *Neo-colonialism* was really a prophecy of an Americanised globalisation.
Résumé

L’héro de la décolonisation africaine et le premier noir postcolonial africain leader, Kwame Nkrumah, a étudié dans tous les deux pays les Etats Unis d’Amérique (USA) et en Grande Bretagne. Il a aussi bien visité la plupart des pays occidentaux. Quand il ciblait les empires coloniaux comme le Royaume Unis (UK) durant la décolonisation, il s’est attaqué à l’Amérique comme source des problèmes de post-Independence qu’il a nommé néo-colonialisme. Ce dernier est, pour lui, le changement de tactiques des colonialistes quand ils sont défis par les militants de leur colonies. Ils ont adoptés les politiques des programmes d’aide et les slogans de libération en fin de perpétuer la colonisation. Ces pays colonisateurs étaient, malgré tout, eux même sous les invisibles ailes de l’aigle Américain destiné à rependre son néolibéral capitalisme à travers le globe entier. D’après Nkrumah, durant la décolonisation les USA ont joués catalyseur entre colonisateurs et colonisés pour atteindre son statut de néo-colonialiste. De ce fait, Nkrumah a écrit Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism (Néo-colonialisme, le dernier stade de l’impérialisme) en 1965 pour dénoncer ce néolibéral capitalisme Américain qui est un facteur majeur de la mondialisation contemporaine. En effet, ce mémoire tente à analyser ce livre de Nkrumah à la lumière de la mondialisation pour confirmer que Néocolonialisme était la prophétie d’une mondialisation américainisée.
ملخص

كواي نكروما هو بطل التحرر الإفريقي و أول زعيم أسود في فترة ما بعد الاستعمار. درس نكروما في كل من الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية (ومأ) و بريطانيا بالإضافة إلى العديد من الدول الغربية التي سافر إليها. هدف نكروما إلى انتقاد الدول المستعمرة خلال فترة التحرر وذلك بتحملها مسؤولية المشاكل في فترة ما بعد الاستقلال وهو ما يعرف بالاستعمار الحديث. إن هذا الأخير بالنسبة لـ نكروما ما هو إلا عبارة عن تغيير على مستوى المخططات الاستعمارية. بعد الانسحاب العسكري الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية تبنت مشاريع تتمثل في مساعدات تحت شعار الحرية. بكلمة أخرى هذه المشاريع تتمثل في النظام الامبريالي والذي يدوره نظام أمريكي رأسمالي ليبرالي. إن المكون الأساسي في العولمة هو هذا النظام الأمريكي. من هذا المنطلق كواي نكروما يؤمن بأن الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية لعبت الدور الأساسي بين المستعمر و المستعمر من أجل تحقيق مصلحتها الشخصية و هي الاستعمار الحديث. وهو ما جسدته نكروما من خلال كتابه (1965) Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism. إن هذه المذكرة تهدف إلى دراسة هذا الكتاب في ظل نظام العولمة و ذلك من أجل تأكيد أن الاستعمار الحديث يجسد تجربة نكروما بالعولمة الأمريكية.
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General Introduction

The end of the Second World War (WWII) in 1945 was the turning point in the course of world history. It was a time when the traditional European colonial powers, be it Britain, France, or others, could not be counted on to lead the contemporary world. As the war wrecked Europe, only two superpowers rose to world dominance: the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The World then entered a phase of ‘bipolarisation;’ the capitalist pole was led by the USA while the communist pole was led by the Soviets. The other free nations were all to choose an ally between the two poles. Therefore, bipolarisation became like a campaign to ‘uni-polarisation’ or ‘globalisation’ and the competition for it was called the Cold War (CW).

The Cold War was a distant chess game between the superpowers in which small nations were the pawns. Just like the pawns of a chess game, the small nations also varied in importance and power in that Cold War. The two superpowers stepped to divide Europe which was laming from the nightmare of the two world wars with an Iron Curtain into two camps: a western capitalist camp and an eastern communist camp. Then, they moved to dominate Europe’s overseas colonies, which were swept by a wave of nationalism and self-awareness by the end of the WWII. In the race for uni-polarisation/globalisation, both the United States and the Soviets promoted
strategic programmes of assistance for the reconstruction of damaged Europe and for the decolonisation movements worldwide. By the end, the globalists, especially America, could be qualified with no more than the term ‘catalysts,’ or neo-colonialists, between colonisers and colonised.

As a result of the Cold War strategies, the Ghanaian nationalist Kwame Nkrumah (1909-1972) wrote a book entitled *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* in 1965 which was critical of the colonialists, old and new. Nkrumah denounced capitalist American and European assistance, or aid, to the African continent as well as to the whole developing countries. This book qualifies the capitalist countries as ‘neo-colonialists,’ with America in the forefront, and it warns the whole world how to recognise these neo-colonialists and how to avoid falling into their ‘invisible’ traps. Nkrumah makes it clear that his book is “an attempt to examine neo-colonialism not only in its African context and its relation to African unity, but in world perspective” because neo-colonialism is not “exclusively an African question.” He also warns against neo-colonialism because it failed worldwide and at all ages in “raising living standards or in ultimately benefiting countries which have indulged in it.”

Effectively, this is the stronghold of *Neo-colonialism* from which we draw our thesis in this research project. As the above explanation can evidence, the theme of the book concerns the whole universe. This Mémoire sees Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* as a global denunciation of a global phenomenon; the book is also about the global leaders and those they led in this global world. Thus, it is strongly held here in this research as a thesis that this book, written in 1965, prophesised today’s globalisation dominated by the United States.
Interestingly, this research is going to be a theoretical analysis on Kwame Nkrumah's book. In another word, it is a historical analysis of Neo-colonialism in relation to some of its contemporary documents and events as well as with today’s globalisation documents and facts. It will analytically draw the clear-cut relationship between neo-colonialism as an old terminological synonym for the current overwhelmingly used word, globalisation. For sure, this is not going to be the first work done about any of the two concepts or their relationship but it will be the first one to make a cause and effect analysis of predictive elements of not only globalisation but of an Americanised globalisation in Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism*.

In the course of this research, we try to illuminate the way Nkrumah had been as smart as an African fortune-teller to mention something that will be occurring two decades later. In fact, this work could be important, especially, in our English Department in the field of Anglo-American Studies because it is about the legacy of a post-colonial African nationalist leader, firstly. Secondly, there is a great academic lack of all that is African studies in the Department. Thirdly, globalisation is an up to date topic and this thesis will be a clear-cut contribution toward it. Lastly, we are in a victim country of neo-colonialism disguised in the name of modernisation.

Furthermore, this thesis aims also at investigating the relationship between the USA and *Neo-colonialism* and will try to plausibly answer these questions: what led Kwame Nkrumah to write this book? How and why did Nkrumah accuse the United States of being a neo-colonialist power in the book? What are the factors which make this book, *Neo-colonialism*, a prediction of globalisation? Is it its accusation of America that makes it a prediction of globalisation? Finally, was it a pro-globalist or an anti-globalist prediction?
In fact, from its publication onward, this book has attracted attentions. Today, it intrigues too many opinions when contextualising its content and its setting. In trying to do so, we come to hypothesise that Nkrumah has written his *Neo-colonialism* only for the sake to be renowned as the nationalist hero of decolonisation in the circumstances of the Cold War like Thomas Jefferson had become after his Declaration of Independence. Another hypothesis is that Nkrumah has written the book in order to make the western capitalists, particularly the United States, bear the cause of his governmental failure in Ghana and in Africa as a whole. However, the strongest claim among all hypotheses is that Nkrumah, during his intellectual sojourns in America as well as in Europe, had a very bad perception of the neo-liberal capitalistic politico-economic systems of the Western world. This led him to expose his disgust of those systems in his *Neo-colonialism*.

Indeed, it is common knowledge that nothing is from void. This maxim is also applicable to the question of the sources we rely on in this Mémoire. Scores of valuable documents, books, and articles about Nkrumah has been published: For example, when reading Ama Biney’s *The Political and Social Thought of Kwame Nkrumah* (2011), one can claim to have personally known Nkrumah in person because this book unearths all about his personal life as well about his political thought. Biney is a Doctor in Oriental and African Studies from London University and a member of the United Kingdom All African People’s Revolutionary Party (AAPRP). Dietmar Rothermund’s article “From Colonialism to Neo-colonialism” (2006) revisits Nkrumah and tells us how Nkrumah and his many like failed their nations after independence due to the lack of macro/microeconomic system within the “invisible hand” of the US Marshall Plan. He questions whether Nkrumah has written *Neo-colonialism* in order to cleanse himself from this failure. Philippa Levine’s
“Decolonisation” (2007) tackles the tactics played by the US invisible government after the WWII between colonisers and colonised, tactics reflective of a Machiavellian political realism. *A Companion to American Foreign Relations* written by Robert D. Schulzinger (2003) is another valuable source that exposes the relationships of the USA with the entire world from Europe to Africa and Asia, nation by nation and president by president. *A Companion to Europe Since 1945* (2009) edited by Klaus Larres is another implacable source that contains a collection of studies which appraise European relations with the communist USSR and the capitalist USA in relation to decolonisation and WWII which were features of attraction in the Soviet-USA global race.

Importantly, another collection of indispensable works deal with globalisation, the nucleus of this thesis. If there is a single book that analyses globalisation in the present day, it might be Samuel. P. Huntington’s *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996). This book is one of the prominent angle marks through which we see if our claim or thesis that Neo-colonialism was a prediction of globalisation is affirmatively right or just a personal conviction. George Klay Kieh, Jr. in his *Africa and the New Globalization* (2008) divides globalisation to ‘old’ and ‘new’ and analyses its last stage in relation to Africa. His article “Neo-Colonialism: American Foreign Policy and the First Liberian Civil War” published in *The Journal of Pan African Studies* in 2012 supports one of Huntington’s ideas that decolonisation had replaced colonial emancipation wars by the conflicts amongst liberated people but he differs from him by blaming those conflicts on America.

But, reasonably, all these would be futile if we do not draw a clear relationship between the terms ‘globalisation’ and ‘neo-colonialism.’ For this, we set Nkrumah’s own definition of neo-colonialism in comparison to Simon Reich’s in “What is
Globalisation? Four Possible Answers” (1998). This helps us to know the similarities and differences between the two words. Indeed, these two concepts are more similar than different. This is why David Rooney has seen Kwame Nkrumah in *Kwame Nkrumah: Vision and Tragedy* (2007) as a transcendentalist dreamer like his counterpart American Martin Luther King whose dreams or visions were too much in advance of their time. But their visions could still be realised if their audiences in the whole world are keen learners from mistakes committed by their-like imprudent heroes in the past. These works and many others are, in fact, the sources of the facts and ideas in this Mémore.

Methodologically, this research work adopts quantitative or theoretical. Or, it is a historical analysis of *Neo-colonialism* in relation to some of its contemporary documents and events as well as with some of today’s globalisation documents and facts. It will analytically draw the clear-cut relationship between neo-colonialism as an old or the Third Word’s concept for the current overwhelmingly used word, globalisation. It is a review of historical documents as our above sources denote. The style is the seventh edition of Modern Language Association (MLA).

The Mémoire contains two main chapters. The first chapter is a cause and effect narrative, particularly the effect of the Cold War on the writing of *Neo-colonialism*, *The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965). It discusses strategies the USA used during decolonisation in order to attract both colonisers and colonised to opt for a liberal capitalist democracy rather than a Soviet communist system with evidences taken in *Neo-colonialism*. This chapter searches for possible answers of why *Neo-colonialism* targeted the USA. The second chapter is a case study which analyses *Neo-colonialism* with reference to globalisation. It seeks to dig out all tangible factors, implicit and explicit, that make the book a prophecy of globalisation. It seeks also to establish the
real relationship between neo-colonialism and globalisation. The research concludes that *Neo-colonialism* could be nothing else than a prediction of an American dominated globalisation.
Chapter one: Historical Background to Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965)

**Introduction**

An old African proverb says that a man is just like mud. The way mud is formatted into a given shape by a designer, a brick-layer or any other mechanics is the same for a man. But, for a man, it is his environment that shapes him. The only difference between a man and mud is that the former is developmental and productive from childhood to maturity. He goes under many experiences and influences because he is not only a being but a reasonable one. Consequently, he learns, imitates, and even creates or invents in his environment from those experiences and influences and no human is exception of this cyclic of development even Kwame Nkrumah. For this reason this chapter aims at investigating the factors that, in the past, made Kwame Nkrumah the visionary of today. How did he become a nationalist or a Pan-Africanist (PA)? Who and what influenced him? Why did he write *Neo-colonialism*? In what context and why it targeted the USA? We answer these questions through some events and their evidences in the *Neo-colonialism.*
I. The Making of the Nationalist Kwame Nkrumah

1. The Man and the Book

Kwame Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* is reflective of his own life which met with an important period in world history: that of decolonisation and globalisation. Nkrumah was born in the former British colony of Gold Coast, currently Ghana, on the verge of the First World War (WWI) outbreak. Then as young, he experienced the colonial exploitations in Africa. In 1935, he went to the USA for study which would take him ten years. At the end of the WWII, Nkrumah moved to London where he became aware of the Cold War (CW) activities of the USA and the USSR. Out of the worldwide decolonisation movement that followed, Nkrumah became the first black African nationalist to lead his country to independence in 1957 and ruled it until 1966, one year after the publication of his book *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*. His life, therefore, has been heightened by major events in world history in which he was an observer and a player.

Nkrumah targeted the colonial countries during his fight for independence but his *Neo-colonialism* is a rebuke of the different American systems as he saw them as the sources of post-independence world problems. The book is a frank denunciation of American political, economic, military and cultural systems. Its publication “offended the American government to the extent that the US Ambassador, Mennen Williams, registered a formal protest to the Ghanaian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Accra in 1965” (Biney, "Legacy of Nkrumah" 128). Worse, Ahmad A. Rahman said in *Regime Change of Kwame Nkrumah: Epic Heroism in Africa and the Diaspora* (2007), when the book was published, the State Department telegraphed the US embassies in Africa
to issue punitive actions against Nkrumah because it “contains unmistakable hostile
charge against US Government;” it is an anti-American book (199).

Originally published in English in New York, USA by International Publishers
in 1965, *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* is composed of two parts: The
first part tackles the definition of neo-colonialism and describes its effects as a system
operating between developed worlds and undeveloped ones. Nkrumah states that “the
essence of neo-colonialism” is to give a former colony an impression of faked
“international” sovereign independence whereas “in reality its economic system and
thus its political policy is directed from outside.” To explain, these arguments concern
the way in which the capitalist powerful nations, i.e.: the neo-colonialists, deceitfully
rush to ‘aid’ the newly-decolonised states politically and economically in guise of
“raising their living standards, but the economic object of neo-colonialism is to keep
those standards depressed in the interest of the developed countries.” This part of the
book ends up by stressing that “military aid in fact marks the last stage of neo-
colonialism and its effect is self-destructive” for both the neo-colonialist and its
victim.

The second part of the book exposes the mechanisms of neo-colonialism from its
origins to its future outcomes. In general, this part traces the origins of neo-
colonialism from the end of the WWII and blames the USA for being the head of all
neo-colonialists. According to Nkrumah, neo-colonialism occurs when the
imperialists, faced with resistance from the former colonies, switch the tactics to praise
‘freedom’ or power handovers while at the same time they try to perpetuate
colonialism. The paradox is that the USA was not a colonial or imperialistic power;
rather, as a leader in a bipolar world, it contributed much to decolonisation. So how
could Nkrumah call it the foremost neo-colonialist and why such a blatant attack on the American systems?

Therefore, the focus of this chapter is to find plausible answers to these questions by analysing some tangible environmental experiences that affected Nkrumah’s life and thought. It is commonly approved that a man is only what his society has made him to be. This maxim can be traced back to the philosophers Nicholas Machiavelli and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Then, what were the circumstances that led Nkrumah to write this book?

2. **The Ideological Formation of Kwame Nkrumah**

Wherever we find social injustice, in whatever guise, there will be men and women to stand against it. This axiom is at the core of Marxism. Kwame Nkrumah was born and raised in Ghana, formerly Gold Coast, under British colonialism. Ghana and all Africa, except for Ethiopia and Liberia, were either under British rule or that of other European colonial powers like France, Belgium, Portugal, and Spain. As a child, he witnessed the WWI. He completed his primary education in Ghana and became an untrained pupil-teacher at a young age. During this period, he met James Kwegyir Aggrey, the assistant vice-principal of the Government Training College in Gold Coast. Aggrey was a Ghanaian who studied in the USA whom Nkrumah has acknowledged as the source of his nationalist inspiration and his belief in the sameness of all Africans, white or black. Nkrumah also gives credit to S. R. Wood, secretary of the National Congress of British West Africa (NCBWA), for the building of his political and educational career since he was the one who proposed him to further his study at Lincoln University in the US (Biney, *Political of Nkrumah* 12).
In addition to Aggrey and Wood, the Nigerian former student from Lincoln University and editor of *The African Morning Post*, Nnamdi Azikiwe, was another figure that further inspired Nkrumah to travel to the United States to pursue his studies (Asamoah 2). According to Ama Biney, Nkrumah also recognised the effect of the Sierra Leonean agitator I. T. A. Wallace Johnson and his article “Has the African a God?” published in *The African Morning Post* in the early 1930s. Biney reported that the article “asserted the right of Africans to determine their own destiny and denounced the hypocrisy of European civilization.” In addition to these figures, she continues, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, just when Nkrumah was on his way to the USA, affected him. She concluded: “the fiery language and radical outlook of Zik’s [Nnamdi Azikiwe] newspaper and [Nkrumah] sojourn in the United States, which was to last for ten years” were to deepen his “intellectual growth and political commitment to freeing Africa from colonial rule” (*Political of Nkrumah* 12-13). Those men started something and Ethiopia case did the rest since it stood for the Nkrumah’s only African pride.

From European colonialism in Africa, passing by the two world wars, to the experience of capitalist social inequalities and racism in the United States, Nkrumah seems to question the nature and the morality of the human being. The answers for his questions are most likely to be found in the field of social sciences so that he was directed to read works of many influential literary and political figures. His voracious reading included the work of Kant, Hegel, Descartes, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Freud, Marx, Lenin and Mazzini (Rooney 30). Like those thinkers, Nkrumah was not someone of a local thinking but of a global one. But due to the circumstances of the time, Nkrumah found that he himself, an African and a black, was viewed no more than a savage issued from the ‘heart of the darkness’ of the ‘Third World’ who was in
need of the Western civilisation. That was universal humiliating denigration which he abominated from the soul of his heart. Nkrumah saw himself as the liberator and the restorer of the universal dignities and virtues of his race from this euphemism.

Nkrumah also lived in the USA at the time of Jim Crow laws. Although he never identified himself with the black Americans’ civil right movement, he admitted the influence of the Afro-Jamaican Garvey Marcus (Poe 83). Nkrumah himself testified in his “Autobiography that his intellectual influences... included Karl Marx, Lenin, and Mazzini. However, it was Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey, published in 1923, that deeply impacted him (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 18). Marcus was the first one who stated that Africa is for Africans and started the “back to Africa” movement. He founded the Black Star Line Association for the shipment of Africans from Americas to their homeland, Africa.

Nkrumah believed in communalism as well as in socialism. He believed in the union and oneness of all Africans and African descendents, the reason for which he devoted great efforts to Pan-Africanism (PA). He made no distinction between white and black, European and African, or West and the “Rests”—to use Edward Said’s term. Partnership between both sides could be possible if politically, economically and culturally they were left free to choose their own principles of cooperation (Rooney 26). But later, Nkrumah “diametrically opposed” Marcus’ opinion of European involvement in Africa development (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 18). This is evident in Nkrumah’s later works like L’Afrique doit s’unir (1963) and Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare: A Guide to the Armed Phase of the African Revolution (1969).
3. **The Spark of Nkrumah’s Activism**

If Marxists believe that the economic system is at the basis of all social problems, Nkrumah realised that the solution for those problems can only be politics. Thus, he turned to political activities. In 1942 at Lincoln, he headed the Association of African Students (AAS) in the US and Canada, which was founded in 1941 with the aim of presenting Africa to Americans. This association had a branch in England called the West African Student Union (WASU) which was claiming African independence. In building the AAS, Nkrumah differed in principles from his Nigerian colleagues: Those wanted to limit membership to students from specific ethnic groups while Nkrumah wanted *Africanity* to be the criterion of membership. By this, he aimed to unite not only Africans but all the descendents from Africa regardless of their background, an idea embodied in Marxism.

Nkrumah moved also to embrace PA in which he upheld a perspective on the cultural and racial affinities between Africans born in the diaspora and those born on the African continent, as highlighted in Daryl Zizwe Poe’s *Kwame Nkrumah’s Contribution to Pan-Africanism: An Afrocentric Analysis* in 2005 (10). He saw all these necessary for making an African identity different from the European one or what he called the “African Personality.” He also hoped to influence Afro-Americans by using Garvey’s slogan of “a people without knowledge of their history is like a tree without roots.” In this, he wanted to convince them that the race problem is a global problem not just an American one. Visibly, Nkrumah was preparing for a free and sovereign Africa where these diaspora could be its engineers from the start. More, we can clearly see here that Nkrumah was not a localist or sectionalist but a large unionist who believed in the betterment of Africa as whole and in universal humane equality.
At Lincoln University, PA, USA, Nkrumah obtained a bachelors degree in theology, economy and sociology. From the University of Pennsylvania, he also earned a Master of Science in Education and a Master of Arts in Philosophy degrees (Asamoah 3). Nkrumah, however, would not finish a Doctorate dissertation seemingly entitled “The Philosophy of Imperialism, with Specific Reference to Africa” because of his disagreement with sources and supervisor; he preferred to drop it rather than denounce his African culture (Asamoah 3; Biney, Political of Nkrumah 23).

Through his intellectual journey, he discovered that Europe was wrongly the centre of the world. Europeans, if not only Anglo-Saxon, were always positively justified in deeds and thoughts; they were the best race and the most descent and civilised. He also discovered that Africans were the descendents of Ham and the snake that drag humanity from heaven; the dance and singing of Africa people were witchery; and African religions and cultures were nothing than an outdated mythology and savagery. He ironically learned too that in just one strike Europeans will westernise or Europeanise things that are older than even themselves. Kwame Botwe Asamoah evidenced this in that way “we were taught that Mungo Park discovered River Niger, while David Livingston discovered Lake Victoria, when in fact Africans led these two European tourists to the waters” (4). The same can also be said about the Columbus discovery of America and Magellan’s of the Pacific Ocean where they were probably led by natives.

Contemporary Africans were stigmatised as people without history and present; they were ahistoric children living in the darkness of the black coat. These ideas were well advanced by Friedrich Hegel and Victor Hugo. The cruelties, ruthless and rudeness of colonisers were justifiable as the ‘white men burden’ to drag African as well as indigenous out of their superstitions. It was la mission civilizatrice in George
Klay Kieh’s words. The traditional rituals in Africa, excision and humane sacrifices for instances, were seen as savagery; the internecine was said to be African. Wars and territorial annexations were due to the lack of education. But, in effect, Africa did not go to exploit Europe or other people. The world wars did not erupt in Africa or by Africans. The bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the concentration camps and gas or crematory chambers, or even the Indians’ removal and the Trail of Tears cruelty and the catholic-protestant antagonism as well as the American red scare or witch hunt were not Africa’s and Africans had never done their kind.

Abandoning his doctorate dissertation in 1945, Nkrumah left the USA for London where his intellectual journey will mature. Once there, his commitment to PA strengthened when he met George Padmore of Trinidad, the revolutionist secretary of the PA association. Padmore played a big role in Nkrumah’s life first as his political mentor then, when Nkrumah became President of Ghana, as his advisor for African Affairs (Poe 106). Together, as joint-secretaries, they organised the Fifth Pan-African Congress (PAC) in 1945 in Manchester under the chairmanship of W. E. B. Du Bois (Asamoah 7) whom Biney calls the father of PA.

Nkrumah’s political activities in Britain overshadowed his scholarly ones; within two years after his arrival to London, he became the general secretary of PA, he presided over WASU, and became the “rapporteur” of Pan-African Federalism (PAF) in North and West Africa. Further, he set up the West African National Secretariat (WANS) which contained a special Circle. The Circle aimed at starting revolutions in Africa; its motto was the “Three S’s— Service, Sacrifice and Suffering” (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 33). As the secretary of WANS, Nkrumah visited Paris to meet with African nationalist leaders like Leopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal and Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast (Rooney 44). Since then, Nkrumah rose to
world attention and in 1947 he was invited to serve Gold Coast, his homeland, as General Secretary of the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC), a moderate nationalist organisation of Ghanaian people.

The ideology becomes power once it goes through the mass. In another way, practice makes perfection. An ideology taken from Aggrey, developed while at Lincoln and Pennsylvania Universities, and practiced while in London made possible the Nkrumah’s PA dream when he returned to Gold Coast. Indeed, the ten years in the USA and the two years in PAC in London shaped his thinking but his ideological perfection started in Gold Coast when he became General Secretary of the UGCC.

Although the foremost driving force behind colonisation has always been the economic reason, Nkrumah’s priority was political freedom which, for him, will bring all other necessities for the welfare of the people of Ghana and of Africa. He had already developed these views while he was in the USA in his book *Towards Colonial Freedom*. Accordingly to David Rooney, a scholar from Cambridge, Nkrumah’s viewed that “because all colonial powers used colonies to exploit their raw materials and as their dumping ground for manufactured goods, the colonies must stand together to achieve political independence as the only way of securing economic independence” (34).

### 4. From Decolonisation to Pan-Africanism

When Nkrumah arrived in his homeland, there were plenty of nationalists in only two organisations, Gold Coast People’s League and Gold Coast National Party, which combined together to form the UGCC. Those nationalists were too moderate, inconsistent and unorganised in principles and in actions. They were like petty
bourgeois manipulated by the colonisers. They wanted independence just in order to take the place of the colonial officials, which would be a loss for the common people. Also they were not pan-africanists in the sense of Ghana’s or Africa’s unity. In other words, they were only interested in a sectional part of the country instead of the nation or the African continent. Furthermore they were, mostly businessmen without much time or experience of political life. As Biney would say:

This infant body of a handful of men was greatly in need of an organiser to build the convention, and with Nkrumah’s appointment the social makeup of the movement changed considerably in a relatively short space of time...

Hence, Nkrumah was hired with this clearly defined task (Political of Nkrumah 36).

Once in his official post, Nkrumah worked towards the fulfilment of his ambition: the political, economic, military and cultural freedom of all Africa. Each one of these was unattainable by a one man. Each was impossible to reach immediately for all Africa. So, Nkrumah would have to carry out his scheme step by step and one by one. But the Ghanaians who invited him did not have any idea about how far his nationalism was and they did not know what his philosophical strategy to achieve the independence was, which they would really regret later as informed by Rooney (48). Because of their different ideologies, Nkrumah set up a new political party, the Conventional People Party (CPP), in 1949 which became the main rival of the UGCC. This was his first step towards the making of Ghana.

In doing so, even though Nkrumah differed in ideology and philosophy from the UGCC policy, he did not totally disregard all its techniques. For example, like the UGCC members’ intention to liberate first Northern Ghana instead of the whole
nation, Biney maintains that “Nkrumah considered territorial independence as a prelude to West African unity and appeared to adjust his view in order to prioritise national independence before greater regional integration” (*Political of Nkrumah* 37).

Or, put it in another way, he planned first the liberation of individual nations like Ghana, then regional independence, like West Africa, and then the integration of the African continent in some form of a federal system or an intergovernmental unity of all Africa, which was his ultimate objective.

The return of Nkrumah to Ghana coincided with a number of international circumstances that helped him materialise his ideas. First, Britain, the colonising power of his country, was weakened by the WWII; second, both superpowers of bipolarisation, the USA and the USSR, opposed European colonialism; third, the Atlantic Charter, which Churchill himself signed, supported the right of all people to choose their own form of government; finally, Europeans could no more be considered as an example of the civilised and civilising people because of the atrocities they committed against each other during the two world wars. All these conditions helped Nkrumah put his Pan-African theory into practice. “He had been granted a rare moment of awe-struck international intention, and he intended to take advantage of it” (Valk 33).

Most of the time, the worst period for some people is the best for others. This was the case when the USA and the USSR triumphed over devastated Western Europe at the end of the WWII. Nothing is, in fact, more humiliating for a world leader than to be subjected to another. This was the situation Europe, particularly Britain, was going through. After the WWII, the euro-colonisers were diminishing from a first power status to a third power status after the USA and the USSR. Being suspicious of this dishonouring state to come, they looked for any approachable means in order to
restore their dignity. As their problem was caused by the economic devastation of the war, and as most of their economic prosperities were, prior the war, from the colonies, they turned to the most extreme exploitation of their colonies while these were no more submissive as they used to be. So this led to incessant troubles between colonisers and colonised.

For instance, in Gold Coast one of these troubles is indispensable when narrating Nkrumah’s history. In 1948, one year after Nkrumah’s arrival, a riot broke out to protest against inflation and ended by calling for the boycott of British goods. When the British governor failed to reduce prices like he promised, Rooney stresses, the riot erupted into violence and ended up in bloodshed where 29 Ghanaians were killed and more than 200 injured. Nkrumah and five other members of the UGCC, the “Big Six,” were wrongly arrested. Because Nkrumah was engaged in communist activities, such as the forming of radical organisations, which even his co-leaders of the UGCC did not approve of, they accused him of stirring up the riot. The accusation, Rooney continues, was worth six weeks in jail for Nkrumah (64-5). That became known as his “nationalist prison grade” (Biney, *Political of Nkrumah* 2).

On release from prison, Nkrumah broke with the UGCC and formed his own party, the CPP in 1949, founded his own newspaper, *Accra Evening News* and came up with the slogan “Self-Government Now” which, according to Rooney, “upstaged the more ponderous UGCC slogan ‘Self-Government in the Shortest Possible Time’” (68). From that time on, the popularity of Nkrumah increased. In addition to the self-eulogies in his own newspaper, Rooney elaborates, “Nkrumah organised the masses” which he aroused “with fiery oratory, slept on their verandas, shared their hardships, captivated them with his charm, enthusiasm and passion [and] inflamed people with
his demand of ‘Self-Government Now’” (71). Finally, Nkrumah obtained his Marxist organisation, mass unity. Henceforth, he moved to end British colonialism.

In 1950, Nkrumah adopted a strategy called “Positive Action” campaign. This was the manifestation of the influence of Mahatma Gandhi’s civil disobedience on him. Nkrumah organised a series of peaceful strikes and boycotts for which he was imprisoned but his movement did not stop. Thus, Britain drew a new plan for the future of the Gold Coast, and this new plan was the democratisation of the colony with an Elected Council. The election was held in 1951, Nkrumah won while still jailed. He got his freedom and became the leader of the government still under colonial rule. Asamoah pointed out that “in 1953, in a major speech titled, ‘The Motion of Destiny,’” he [Nkrumah] demanded from the British government an early date for Ghana’s full independence.” He further summarised that Nkrumah subsequently won re-election in 1954 and 1956 (7). With welfare program problem at home, the Cold War threatening the European continent and the maturity of Gold Coast nationalist movement assured Britain the futility of enforcing old-fashion domination, as expressed in Neo-colonialism. On March 6, 1957, Nkrumah achieved the independence of Gold Coast as Prime Minister and renamed it after the eleventh century Sudanese Empire, Ghana. In 1960, he transformed Ghana into a Republic and won the national general election as the President of the country until 1966.

The independence of Ghana is incredibly symbolic in African nationalist history as well as in the history of African descendents. Nkrumah became the source of inspiration for Africans and for blacks:

he [Nkrumah] had given pride and self respect, not only to Ghana, but to the whole Africa and to the black in the world over. The Ghana’s move
towards independence seemed to many like Africa’s first attempt to claw back some of the power and dignity which had been lost [to] Europeans during the decades of colonial rule and economic exploitation. The revolution which took place in Africa... stemmed directly in the Ghana’s example and from Nkrumah’s achievement (Rooney 21).

Obviously, after Ghana’s independence Nkrumah seemed to make no difference between Ghana’s domestic policy and that of Africa as a whole. As he stated “the independence of Ghana is meaningless unless linked to the total liberation of the African continent.” He wanted a liberated Ghana in a liberated Africa (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 78). He despised the European cake-like frontiers drawn in Africa. The future of Ghana was the future of Africa. Africa was one, for him, and Africans are all one people. This was the philosophy of Nkrumah and he was ready to die for its realisation. It is expounded in his Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization first published in 1964 and re-published in 1970. This book looks down on the problem of religious disparities in Africa to praise African communality as he called “triple heritage.” Another example, he promoted was the project of electrification and industrialisation based on the construction of an artificial lake known as the Volta River Project (VRP) that he negotiated with the USA during his 1958 trip there (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 100). This project would be serviceable for the development of all Africa but it was hardly achieved.

From that time on, Ghanaians as well as the whole world came to understand that Nkrumah’s cling on PA was not just a theory. So he had to be curbed. Then, oppositions started; Nkrumah’s government started to fissure; Corruption was everywhere; many assassination attempts missed him and his families were blackmailed (Asamoah 13). Even though most of African states got their freedoms, his
ideology of African governmental unity was seen as a dream that will never be realised. In 1965, Ghana went into bankruptcy. At the end, he was overthrown in 1966 when he was on his way to Vietnam. Nkrumah died in 1972 as Co-president of Sékou Touré’s Guinea-Conakry where he had been welcomed after the Coup.

5. **Assessment**

Effectively, when analysing those events in Nkrumah life we can say that they have affected his writing of *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*. But in fact, when analysing this book, the content will lead us into something different. The title seems to be a reverberation of Vladimir Lenin’s *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916)*. Mass union and call for socialism known as ‘Nkrumahism’ are derived from Marxism. The white racist stereotype of Africans and African descendents in Africa and overseas made him see these people as one. It is even the source of his PA vision which he had overtly pronounced in his discourse at the Addis Ababa Conference, Ethiopia in May 1963 at the summit of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) before representatives from almost every African State (31 independent states precisely). Clyde Sanger, in his “Toward Unity in Africa” (1964), compared this conference to the congress meeting of 55 men at Philadelphia in May 1787.

At this conference, Nkrumah stated: “*nous devons maintenant nous unir où périr*” (Nkrumah, *L’Afrique doit s’unir*). He was seeing something that his contemporary leaders could not see. This was a prelude to his Consciencism which was an imploring appeal to all African states to come to the organisation of a socialist intergovernmental union. But looking at the same concept in *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah had stated it in this way: “if Africa was united or if we unite” which is
conditional with the most regretful mantra “If.” Now in Neo-colonialism, he is showing the regret why Africa did not unite? Why Africa and its friend Asian and its brother Latin America did not unite? He is now clarifying the reason why the union is really a must.

Right here we can clearly see that this book is no more a repetition of anti-colonial sentiment. But something related to the future in relation to which the past of Nkrumah and the contemporary (present) events are just used as references that cement the arguments that “neo-colonialism like colonialism before it” must be get rid of. In other words, Neo-colonialism, as its title denotes, is no more concerned with Old Colonialism or decolonisation but with Neo (New)-colonialism in which Nkrumah used examples from colonialism and imperialism in order to fortify his stance. But to fight neo-colonialism which is for Nkrumah the evil “stage of imperialism” in Neo-colonialism, he still emphasises union between African governments and all weak nations.

Looking through those historical figures and events that influenced Nkrumah, we will be chocked to meet such an argument as the “foremost of the neo-colonialists is [the] United States.” Those who influenced him have almost all studied in the US or were Americans. None was against America except Garvey who was disgusted by the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant colour-bar. So from where did Nkrumah get this stigma about the USA, especially, the way he described neo-colonialism?

Neo-colonialist is the evil intruder who interferes in every world affair? It is the source of the world’s subversions (coup d’état). Neo-colonialism widens the gap between rich and poor within and between states as well as individuals. It opposes any schemes of large organisation. It has an evangelical method “the overwhelming
majority of them American” which preaches liberation while perpetuating an ever impoverishing exploitation of poor people and weak nations. The neo-colonialist meanly proposes political and economic assistance, and especial “military aid” for weak countries and people but still with a devastating “vested interest” that the given debtor will not be able to pay back, and then the neo-colonialist, will confiscate a source of development from that debtor. “Also demanded and granted are privileges in the cultural field; that Western information services [are] exclusive; and that those from socialist countries [are] excluded.” The neo-colonialist preaches capitalism. It is a sucking tick that has no moral of favour. All these, for Nkrumah, are the vested “Multilateral aid.”

He furthermore stated: “Neo-colonialism is also the worst form of imperialism. For those who practise it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress” (Nkrumah, Neo-colonialism).

This is the summary of some of Nkrumah own descriptions of terms neo-colonialism and neo-colonialists of which the USA is the head. The second part of the book is foremost concerned with the description of American neo-colonialism and the conclusion is a hopeful call for union of powers between Africans and other victims of neo-colonialism.

Eventually, the publication of this book has puzzled many scholars. People question ceaselessly: Why and how did Nkrumah, whose education and whose most influential figures have studied in the USA, attack America in such a way? If his aim was African freedom, why did he not target colonialists in the first position instead of America which had been itself in a time a zone of colonisation like Africa was? However one should not forget to contextualise the content and time of neo-colonialism like his book as well as a concept; for, analyses were more concerned to
do so than the why and how questions. Obviously, the late 1960s was a time when most of African and third world colonies, with their Nkrumah-like nationalists, were decolonised and were looking for a way into world history. In that, Nkrumah described neo-colonialism, as a concept, as the capitalist post-WWII new tactic of colonialism by stating; “in place of colonialism as the main instrument of imperialism we have today neo-colonialism” (Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*).

Actually, Raymond Betts raised that neo-colonialism is a concept adopted by the new nationalists’ “lack of better economic performance after independence” in which field Nkrumah’s book is “to explain the persistence of imperialism in a new guise” (*Decolonization* 75). Importantly, John Darwin situated neo-colonialism as “the result of a change in the structure of international capitalism” that took place during the decolonisation process between colonisers and colonised after 1945. He continued to put this decolonisation in an international business network, in which imperialists and their “old-style colonial rule” were starkly perceivable “as both an obstacle and a threat, blocking the way to an accommodation with the new nationalist Politicians waiting in the wings” of the international business field (Darwin, "Decolonization" 545). That! Nkrumah named “invisible trade.”

Thus, Darwin placed neo-colonialism in the immediate post-WWII era and during the dawn of the global race between the world superpowers starting from 1945 that is in concordance with many examples given by Nkrumah in his *Neo-colonialism*. As a matter of fact, he is not alone in this calculation. Like him, many others scholars see neo-colonialism be it Nkrumah’s book or the concept itself as the denunciations of the US global CW manipulation during decolonisation. This will be the discussion in the following section below.
II. The USA in the Cold War and Decolonisation

Isolationism has long been doctrinal in American foreign policy. The Washington’s ‘Farewell Address’ and the ‘Monroe Doctrine’ had directed the USA international relations until the Spanish-American (1898) that unveiled the manifestation of American Exceptionalism worldwide. Theodore Roosevelt’s slogan “speak softly and carry a big stick” embodies to a new power of imperialism to which Woodrow Wilson added severe ideological ingredients. Wilson believed that the USA is enjoined to spread its democratic institutions and cultures all over the world and that “world must be made safe for democracy” and that “neutrality is ineffectual.” Since then the American democratisation duty expanded from the American continent to the rest of the world. The ‘Fourteen Points’ can justify this.

The Roosevelt’s socialism and Wilson’s idealism would reverberate in the aftermath of the WWII when war events changed every earth’s system. The Europe, the then battlefield, was destroyed; the leading colonialists (Britain and France) declined; their Colonies on continents, led by striving nationalists, wanted independences. World was in a total chaos and it needed an organiser. The USSR saw situation in communist doctrine while the USA opposed offering its neo-liberalist democratic capitalism; consequently, the Cold War bipolarisation started. It was a global race for the domination of world economy, politic, military, culture and ideology. Each of the antagonists had to attract allies from other nations. Fortunately for them, that coincided with a time of distresses. Imperial Europe wanted money for reconstruction and other parts of world, most under colonialism, wanted liberation (decolonisation). So, all that the globalist new superpowers, USSR and USA, needed
was to propose *assistance* for those nations in need in order to achieve their own goal of global dominance.

As a consequence of this global race, Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* was written. It is an announcement of his disappointment about the CW implication in his nationalist movement. So here, we are seeking to unveil the effects of American neo-liberalist assistances (or aids) in Nkrumah’s book.

1. **The USA Global Race in Europe**

Whenever we mention the CW people just picture the USSR or the USA. Most of the times, they recollect the Cuban Missile Crisis of the 1960s whereas, long before this event, the CW was hot in many other parts of the planet and affected the whole universe in general. Nkrumah, in *Neo-colonialism*, summarised the global race in these words:

Foremost among the neo-colonialists is the United States, which has long exercised its power in Latin America. Fumblingly at first she turned towards Europe, and then with more certainty after world war two when most countries of that continent were indebted to her. Since then, with methodical thoroughness and touching attention to detail, the Pentagon set about consolidating its ascendancy, evidence of which can be seen all around the world.

Evidently, the two world wars presented the opportunity for the United States to extend its continental exceptionalism to worldwide imperialism. After the Spanish-American war, America has informally imperialised Latin America. In order to acquire the entire world now, it had to conquer Europe first especially Britain and
France because these were the only imperial superpowers remaining after the WWII that controlled vast territories worldwide. The British system still dominated the world but it is in a pitiful condition and the French Empire followed Britain miserably. The war “ensured that the once proud nations of the European continent would for years be preoccupied with physical survival, reconstruction, and political and social reconciliation” but USSR, in just a three years period, swallowed the entire Eastern Europe including “once fully sovereign countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Baltic states, Bulgaria, Romania” (Larres 1).

The world leaders of the once most industrialised countries are expected to provide solutions because families were split, widows and orphans were innumerable, houses blasted and farms and forest rendered barren due to war devastations. Even though the allies won the war it was a “Pyrrhic victory” (Schmidt ‘s term) and now populations see governments as their last hope. What could governments do when they were, themselves, easy-preys for the hungry globalists? Both Britain and France were desperately suspicious that communist Soviets would turn toward them after they finished with Eastern Europe, like Hitler’s Germany tried to do once it had finished with Poland. Worst, they had already promised welfare policies to their populations but how could their schemes be carried out? Should they offer themselves on a silver plate to the USA? That was a humiliation. Or should they just wait for the destiny to decide who (USA or USSR) deserves them?

Even worst, the colonies were no more at ease. Levine points out “despite its own imperial ambitions, the USSR found it valuable to foster and fund nationalist movements in colonies under western European rule.” The British Middle East mandates, Egypt and India being betrayed for their self governing promise, raised nationalist movements advocating independence. Levine advances that the USA also
“rejected colonialism and . . . [supported] a State Department official paper, released in 1942, for national independence for colonies.” All that aggravated Euro-imperialists’ situation; beside, the newly-set organisation of the United Nations (UN) also opposed colonialism (193-5). Then Europe was caught in a dilemma.

### a. Europe’s Dilemma

Europeans, in their situation, were analytical and have drawn any yielding probabilities in their dilemma. The United States emerged from the war as the only major nation that was not invaded and whose economy was vibrant and thriving. Franklin D. Roosevelt had planned that after the war the USA with the USSR, Britain and China would be the “Big Four” world policemen to stabilise the world (Schmidt 218). As to the USSR, Stalin wanted a world of his own, a world of marxist socialist communism that seemed to Europeans the same as imperialism. Schmidt reported Polish Marshall Smigly-Rydz who stated: “With the Germans we risk the loss of our liberty, but with the Russians we lose our soul” (209). He further emphasised that the Soviets wanted to communise the world “while we [the Americans] wanted to free the world” (220). Nkrumah shrewdly analysed this situation; in *Neo-colonialism* he asserted that no post-war European capitalist society could survive like pre-war years without adopting a welfare system no matter which party was in power. As the Europeans did adopt this system, its practice required a master investor, a helper like the USA which readily received them with an “invisible governmental” plan.

In 1946, Churchill pronounced his ‘Iron Curtain’ speech in the USA to exhibit to the Americans how Britain was impotent to come to the help of Greece and Turkey, two free democratic countries that were within the reach of communist risk (Schmidt 222). One year later, the US President Harry S. Truman presented the ‘Truman’s
Doctrine to Congress. The doctrine provided for the American assistance to those nations but it carried a message in a wider context that was generally as a prolongation of Wilsonian Messianism. The doctrine stated: “The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world . . . . Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events” (Finkelman and Lesh 1507). Like Greece, “Everybody in Western Europe was desperate for dollars to finance the imports necessary for reconstruction .... They needed American raw materials such as coal, wheat, and other foodstuffs” (Larres 19). Churchill’s speech seemed to sell Europe to the America because one year after Truman’s Doctrine, Truman signed the Marshall Plan for European war recovery.

In Neo-colonialism, Nkrumah designated American government and American policy as Invisible. He reported this idea from a post in the Wall Street Journal. Here the Truman’s Doctrine could be archetypal evidence. “The Truman Doctrine set the stage for its natural complement, the Marshall Plan, publicly unveiled in a speech delivered by Secretary of State George Marshall at Harvard on 5 June 1947” (Grenville 365). The Doctrine states “It is only common sense that we should safeguard this investment and make sure that it was not in vain” (1507). This statement is ambiguous; it has variable interpretations and variable connotations.

As helps for Greece and Turkey worked well, the Marshall Plan was promoted for all Europe, including USSR which turned it down. Thus, this is the very assistance Nkrumah called neo-colonialism and what Rothermund called the “hidden hand of Neo-colonialism.” This was, in fact, a new colonialism; a colonialism different from all its precedents. It was the start of neo-imperialism in which the neo-liberalist American empire would dominate the world. While the Europeans feared that
“Russian Bear envisaged world domination,” they ignored the invisible destined
“American eagle” coming “to spread its wings across the globe” (Schmidt 221).

Nkrumah did not mention the Marshall Plan in name in Neo-colonialism, but he
perfectly described it. Usually, like after WWI, victors ask the defeated for war
reparations but the Marshall Plan provided aids to “victors alike vanquished
approximately 2-3% of US national product” (Rothermund 266) to indebted all the
European continent to the USA as is said in Neo-colonialism. The Plan made the
German economic miracle and it helped European nations but it was not a charity and
it was not without consequence. It put all Europe under the US economic control; a
fact all its recipient states regretted. At first, Charles de Gaulle declined the offer and
sought a partnership with the Soviets in fear that the US would command France but
Stalin seemed not to take him seriously, asserted Larres (15). Late in 1948, a
mysterious national workers’ strike broke out to force de Gaulle into this
Americanised economic sphere for good (Larres 19). Nkrumah anticipated that only in
a short term the neo-colonialism would help developed countries.

b. Europe Under Eagle Wings

Based on Nkrumah’s own analysis of events belonging place in Western Europe
at that time, we can figure out why and how much interestingly he ironically
questioned in his book:

Who really rules in such places as Great Britain, West Germany, Japan,
Spain, Portugal or Italy? If General de Gaulle is ‘defecting’ from U.S.
monopoly control, what interpretation can be placed on his ‘experiments’
in the Sahara desert, his paratroopers in Gabon, or his trips to Cambodia
and Latin America?
Nkrumah was wondering about de Gaulle’s malaise of American neo-colonialism. France, unlike its neighbours, did not accept the American offer and remained passive because it knew it was not a generosity but a bondage deal that would affect it negatively. This is why de Gaulle was “defecting.” His first manoeuvre was the acceleration of a process for a federal European Union. Individually, it was obvious that France could not change anything but a union was probably a means of resisting America. While the Europeans were discussing what sort of union they would build (governmental or just economic), the USA became involved in the Korean War and left Europe to the communist threat. This ensured Europeans, especially France, Germany, Italy and Belgium, that time was against them. Larres evidenced this with a report by Italian Spinelli who saw that:

the Marshall Plan, a product of democratic and liberal America, now gave West Europeans the chance to federate; and he [Spinelli] foresaw that if they failed to do so the US, lacking an equal partner, would be liable to shift from the liberal to the imperial alternative (29).

Consequently, Europeans moved speedily toward union. The 1951 European Coal and Steel Company (ECSC) would become European Community (EC) in 1967, which later became the European Union (EU) by means of the Maastricht Treaty of 1991. As a powerful member of the EC, de Gaulle vetoed the British two first attempts of membership in 1961 and 1967 respectively because of its tight relationship with the USA as well as with the Commonwealth (Levine 194). Larres argues that the USA was, in fact, with the creation of the EU in condition it would be a third force to check the communist movement in Eurasia while America would be operating on other fronts. This also increased Europeans suspicion that America was not defending them against communism but just wanted allies to stand against a common enemy while
building its own system. Larres also sees that while the Europeans were slow in reaching a final agreement, the US moved to the making of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1949. NATO was Truman’s alternative idea for the “Third force.” NATO, although full of the USA forces to the systematic defence of the Western Europe, was founded on “quid pro quo.” In return for American troops in NATO, the US would rearm West Germany. Both Britain and France did not approve this rearmament of, but they were blackmailed to accept it or America would withdraw its promise to protect them against any Soviet attack.

That is why Nkrumah book said that “warnings about ‘the dangers of communist subversion are likely to be two-edged” because the alarmist itself during neo-colonialism is not doing things for “generosity.” With the Korean War in 1953 and Moscow’s signing of the Warsaw Pact with East Europe in 1955, NATO moved from Western defence bloc to an international organisation (Larres 47-53).

The Europeans second manoeuvre to counter balance the American power was their return toward the remaining colonies. Eager to recover quickly, Britain, France, Belgium, Spain and Portugal conducted a more detrimental exploitation of their colonies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. There too, they would meet the US supremacy. Indeed if the Cold War was a global thing, the colonies were also part of the globe. So globalists needed their support as much as they needed the Euro-imperialists because they were what made those colonisers the once superpowers.

Russia had already helped spread nationalism in the colonies, the nationalists were sympathetic to Soviet socialism but not yet totally adherent to it. Then, in order for America to attract those nationalists adherence, it must, too, appear as anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist to them. To do so, the US would have, again, to
threaten imperialists or play ‘Machiavellian lion and foxy’ between colonisers and colonised. Therefore, here was where America and its European debtors clashed. India, which was the jewellery of the British Empire, took her “shame-independence” (Nkrumah’s term in *Handbook*) in 1947. Most of the Middle East mandates were in vanguard of decolonisation, especially after the creation of an Israeli State in Palestine. In 1956 Egypt’s nationalisation of the Suez Canal caused a crisis which Britain and France attempted to exploit to further their domination there. America’s hidden plan worked this time again. The USA, as well the Soviets and the UN condemned them and stopped the invasion of Egypt (Levine 197-200). Since then, the invisible government became visible to Europeans but it was too late to exorcise the spell; they lastly adopted it.

The Suez crisis affair taught Europeans, particularly Britain and France, that new powers outdated theirs and that their old-style imperialism was no longer a source of political strength. In all sectors they became subjugated. Politically and culturally they were classified as the West with the USA at the top. Economically, they belonged to the capitalist bloc but privileged with the US Dollar. Ideologically, they were liberal democrats. In all these, the USA was their leader and the USSR, their enemy. This loss of identity pained de Gaulle. He detested being americanised, as Larres asserted. Worse, he also realised that America would risk everything, even sacrificing Europe (Korean War and Vietnam War are points in case), in this CW for just self-interest. From the introduction of the Marshall Plan in 1948 until 1960s, de Gaulle stood “against Washington’s foreign affairs. His “most dramatic act in defiance of Washington was his decision to pull France out of the combined military command of NATO on March 7, 1966” and the foreign NATO troops would leave French soil by 1968 (Larres 55-56).
But unfortunately, to cite Nkrumah, the “invisible government” (US) is a body of many “units and agencies, as well as individuals” in which CIA is the heart “that appear outwardly to be a normal part of the conventional government. It even encompasses business firms and institutions that are seemingly private.” Nkrumah laid down these details for his subsequent eloquent description of American moral and physical treatments of people with anti-American concepts like in the de Gaulle’s case in which anti-de Gaulle movements sparked in France, Algeria and many other French dominions. This invisible part of the US policy is what Adrienne Van Der Valk (2008) called the “crossover” or the “unwritten law in American Liberal Constitution.” This crossover in American liberalism during decolonisation in relation with Nkrumah and in Neo-colonialism is the core of the next section. The latter investigates how American manipulated colonisers and colonised.

2. The USA and Decolonisation

Decolonisation is a nationalist movement started after the WWI and sparkled just after the WWII. Nationalism is a critical factor why decolonisation occurred – and when it occurred– many other issues played an equally prominent role (Levine 1). One of them was the European post-war reconstruction. While the Marshall Plan trapped the Euro-colonisers under the USA control, it was, none the less, effective on the colonised too. These suffered from it even more than the colonisers. The Plan was a loan deemed to rebuild the war damages in Europe in the course of four years; after what, it was to be repaid. For the debtors, in order to be capable to pay back this heavy loan in due time, in addition to the Welfare policy adopted at home, only resources from the colonies were their last hope.
Worse, just after the war the Indian colonies which, in grand part, were the richest source of recovery, were already striking for independence. “With India gone the rationale for the whole [British] empire might seem to have gone;” it was like the removal of the empire heart (Porter 305-6). India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon were all gone during the period 1947-8. They were to be replaced by resources from the mandates of Middle East, colonies in Africa and those of Latin America. Seeking to fill the gap of India led to the extensive exploitation of the remaining colonies. “While Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries all relied more” on import(exports from Europe, it is important to note “that in 1950 Britain and France imported more from developing countries than from the developed nations” (Larres 252). More, the inflation of manufactured products in the colonies became unbearable. That is why from 1945 onward serial strikes broke out in West Africa (Nigeria and Gold Coast) and liberation warfare engulfed in others: the Malays (1948), Vietnam and Algeria (1954) and Egypt (1956).... In short, colonial imperialism started crumbling with the acceleration of colonial liberation movements.

If the USSR supported anti-colonialism in the colonies, the USA was its means. In effect, these two globalists were looking for allies in the colonies while the USSR won the sympathy of the colonised, the colonisers were under the US control. So, in order to prevent those colonies from adhering to communism, America had to work invisibly with the Euro-imperialists. This is why it has been called a catalyst. The success of the Marshall Plan in Europe convinced American political leaders to express their anti-colonial sentiment in order to conduct the Plan into Asia and Africa. But in those places it was more military pacts and aid than economy (Rothermund 267). Here is, according to Nkrumah, where neo-colonialism or “collective
imperialism” started (Nkrumah, *Handbook 5*). He stated it in this way just before he singled out the USA as the “foremost:”

Faced with the militant peoples of the ex-colonial territories in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America, imperialism simply switches tactics. Without a qualm it dispenses with its flags, and even with certain of its more hated expatriate officials. This means, so it claims, that it is ‘giving’ independence to its former subjects, to be followed by ‘aid’ for their development. Under cover of such phrases, however, it devises innumerable ways to accomplish objectives formerly achieved by naked colonialism. It is this sum total of these modern attempts to perpetuate colonialism while at the same time talking about ‘freedom’, which has come to be known as neo-colonialism (*Neo-colonialism*).

Nkrumah has all the reasons to say that because he had experienced this strategy. Most colonies were not yet ready for an open market system. Economically speaking, they lacked macro/microeconomic strides (how to do) while “the ‘invisible hand’ of the market was replaced by the visible hand of the planner” (Rothermund 270). This means that the American preached ‘neo-liberalism’ started with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The plan failed because many new nationalist leaders, after realising that western system does not fit them, opposed it. However, this liberalism was, in fact, neo-colonialism which had a fragile red limit at home as well abroad during the Cold War (Valk 7). This means that the USA supported decolonisation only for the colonies which were apt to adopt the Western democratic economic system and against all other systems as is highlighted: “All indigenous national revolts were, henceforth, seen as inspired by Moscow; all must be met with American military forces” (Schmidt 231).
For example, before granting Ghana self-determination, many investigations overburdened Nkrumah about his past and present activities, Rooney asserts. When Nkrumah was arrested in the 1949 strike, an unsigned communist party card and some stuff of the Circle were seen with him. Another investigation mistakenly added “Soviet;” to Nkrumah’s Circle devise “Union of West African Socialist Republic” all that he had to cleanse himself from (Rooney 65-66). On the eve of the independence, Nkrumah was again obliged to fire his loyal co-workers from CPP in order to appear clean of soviet influence before the neo-colonials as Biney defended: “Nkrumah had to do that . . . It was sad because Turkson Ocran was a very good trade unionist. So was Tony Woode. But Nkrumah acted to save a very serious situation in the attainment of self-government” (Political of Nkrumah 55).

In fact, this was the case with all nationalists in the colonies during the CW and the UN could do nothing about it between bipolar racers. As example, during the CIA-British ‘coup’ in Iran in 1953, the UN was intended to do nothing to save the Prime Minister, Mosaddeq. Levine comments: “But it was clear that the senior partner in this venture was the superpower, and not Britain, and that the rationale for intervention was the Cold War rather than British oil interests” (199). Congo and South Korea are, also, points in case (Nkrumah, Handbook 7). Fear of this neo-colonial invisible or “unwritten law” led Nkrumah and almost all developing countries (22 Asians and 7 Africans) to adopt a non-alignment position between racers in the Bandung conferences (1955) in Indonesia. But adopting non-alignment in theory was not enough. As for America, “neutrality is ineffectual” in global human activities or it is a political immaturity during bipolarisation (Valk 35). Active choices are inevitable and wrong choices are disastrous because the USA is the only one to determine the nature of the choice as would be befallen on Nkrumah after his last choice.
a. **Nkrumah at the Crossover**

Analytically, Nkrumah minimised the power of the neo-colonialists after independence. His non-alignment was no more the same as before. In fact he did not join the communist group but he opted for making a third global racer. The Nkrumah PA socialist policy was a threat to “Western interest” in Africa as well in America (Asamoah 13). Nkrumah coined the motto “seek ye first the political kingdom and all things shall be added unto you” with which he promised Ghanaians an economic paradise after independence. This was a mantra Nkrumah used, not only, for Ghana but for all Africa and African descendents as Biney maintained “The political objectives of the triumphant Nkrumah-led government were to transform the inherited colonial economy and forge a united nation and continent” (*Political of Nkrumah* 79).

Nkrumah tried to play double game in the opportunity offered by the two global racers. He adopted the non-alignment or what Daryl Zizwe Poe called the “Positive Neutrality,” between communism and capitalism just for the sake to reach independence. This was his plan for the realisation of his PA program, the United States of Africa. Soon after independence, he visited Liberia, Sierra Leon and Ethiopia. He held in 1958 an All African People Conference (AAPC) that was attended by Egypt, morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Sudan, Liberia and Ethiopia, then sole Independent African States. The AAPC was also attended by people from Overseas like the wife of Du Bois, Shirley Graham Du Bois, and the peoples from not yet independent areas like Frantz Fanon and four other ‘comrades’ from Algeria, Patrice Lumumba from Congo, Julius Nyerere from Tanganyika (Poe 107-12). In addition to these, Nkrumah heartily called his contemporary nationalist leaders to assist, in whatever means, other African nations which were struggling for independence like
Algeria, Bissau-Guinea and Kenya. In the same year, he travelled to the USA and Canada to deliver speeches in which he was to seduce African descendents to come to Africa. Nkrumah published books, in which he expressed his PA socialism.

Culturally, Nkrumah praised what he called the “African genius.” Unlike the Senghor negritude that “dichotomised reason as Western and sensibility and emotion as inherently African attribute” which was about blackness and whiteness, Nkrumah meant “cooperation and equality” between Africans (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 120). This is evident in his Africa Must Unite discourse in Addis Ababa before more than 30 African head of governments. In his discourse, he highlighted the neo-colonialism that invaded Latin American after their independences; the way the neo-colonialists from America, Britain and France intervene in African domestic policies. He gave the example of the Congo affair pointing out its richness in raw materials and labourers which alone could develop all Africa to the standard of western nations.

That day, Nkrumah questioned African independence without union. He asked heads of states who of them is content with the structure of his government? Who can secure the financial security of their teachers and workers? Who can say he has no problem with foreign banks and exchanges? “Si nous ne créons pas dès maintenant l’Unité africaine, nous qui siégeons ici aujourd’hui, nous serons demain les victimes et les martyrs du néocolonialisme.” (Nkrumah, L'Afrique doit s'unir). In short, Nkrumah wanted what he termed the “African Personality” which means an African contribution to world history: African histories told by Africans peoples; African own institutions different from colonisers; African theatres; African curriculum of education; African control of their media. Giving the example, Nkrumah married an Egyptian to justify his belief in African whites and blacks unity (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 83). But unfortunately:
Within nine years the Nkrumah government was shipwrecked, overthrown as inefficient, corrupt, and authoritarian. The experience of Ghana was neither unique nor unusual. Throughout Africa and much of Asia in the next two decades, the final ones of decolonisation, the cultural landscape was bleak. Disorder and oppression, the military coup d’état and dictatorship were frequent, almost commonplace (Betts 65).

b. **Nkrumah Became Enemy**

If something changed Nkrumah’s choice, it is the UN botchery in Congo in 1960 within the Western interest. Nkrumah succeeded to accelerate the decolonisation of African nations but only Sekou Touré’s Guinea-Conakry and Modibo Keita’s Mali came to governmental union (Sanger, 1964). Had Congo come into union, nothing could have prevented African unity; but the death of Patrice Lumumba marks the end of Nkrumah’s presidency (Rahman 195). Lumumba of Congo was a partisan but Nkrumah, for Eisenhower, was even more radical. Eisenhower approved the CIA “plan to kill Lumumba, and simultaneously began supporting Colonel Joseph Mobutu” (DeRoch 110). DeRoch places the US relations with Africa in the context of, only, the fulfilment of the former self interest.

From Theodore Roosevelt to Jimmy Carter, America was to thwart African unity. Nkrumah said in *Neo-colonialism*: “the evil of neo-colonialism is that it prevents the formation of those large units.” The Americans build the Monrovia Group (including countries like Liberia, Nigeria, Ivory Coast, Senegal etc.) in Liberia as pro-Westerners in opposition to the Casablanca Group (Ghana, Guinea-Conakry, Mali, Niger, Egypt, etc.) which were seen as radicals. The singularity of Africa was swinging for “the African nation . . . is in reality simply divided into two: our enemy
and ourselves” (Nkrumah, *Handbook* 43). The Americans were the source of Nigeria’s Civil War in 1964-7 and Truman supported Apartheid in South Africa while Eisenhower supported Ian Smith’s white supremacy in South Rhodesia (DeRoch 103-20). The USA with “patron-client relationship” exploited different Liberian regimes and ignored Samuel Doe’s genocide of Liberians (Kieh, "Neocolonialism" 164-80). It did this only to fulfil its need of land resources.

Apparently, the All-Africa People Conference in 1958 had also an inestimable effect on the overseas audience. Nkrumah address, concerning “the challenges of black individuals world-wide unequivocally fell under the umbrella of the Pan-African concern and call to action” (Poe 30); aggravated the Civil Rights movement in the USA at a time Jim Crow laws were long target in the Soviet Newspapers. This was fading the international reputation of American liberal democracy solution for what the American presidents (from Truman to Kennedy) promoted the “everybody wins” system (Valk 27-32). When Nkrumah has arranged the cultural and psychological (media) intrusion of the American invisible government in Third World from “news”, Radio to Peace Corps with which Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and CIA operates the neo-colonialism, he did not touch this “everybody wins.” This latter was using African American renowned (singers, writers, civil rights prominent activists, etc.) as symbolic equal liberal co-operation between whites and blacks in America in return of what the government slyly promotes them whereas they were not really free. Also most of these did not know that they were used in the CW context and that they were always followed by the US secret agents.

This is the central theme of Von Eschen’s book *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (2004) in which he narrates tangible State Department’s malicious organised tours of black Jazz stars, like Duke Ellington and
Louis Armstrong with many others, around the world, including the USSR. He points out that this was a strategic weapon under which “CIA operatives had covertly intervened in Syria in 1957 just a year after Dizzy Gillespie’s visit [a Jazz star] to support a military coup against a pro-Communist government” (127). In effect, for him, the Soviets lost the Middle East and Africa due to only these unconscious exploited singers. Senghor, Nkrumah and many others were all victims politically as well culturally of this US cultural exploitation due to their links with Afro-American activists (Eschen 158-60). In the same situation, Valk compared Nkrumah’s unfortunate fate to four black Americans (Paul Robeson, W.E.B. Du Bois, William Patterson, Robert Williams and Josephine Baker) who had all opposed the ‘everybody wins’ and crossed over. As an example, in 1952, in a speech to an Argentinean audience, the star singer Josephine Baker stated, quoted Valk, “Negroes throughout the world entirely rightly are looking upon the United States in the same way the Jewish people pointed a short time ago to the land where they had been sentenced to extinction” (40). He concludes:

Like Robeson and Baker, he [Nkrumah] achieved celebrity status in his home continent and abroad. Like Du Bois he was a central player in the development and dissemination of a racial philosophy that would both inspire and divide black activists for years to come. Like Robert Williams, he voiced a commitment to an ideal he had always held, but changing circumstances would make it dangerous to demonstrate real commitment to that ideal. Like all four, he was ultimately persecuted and displaced (79).

To end up, decolonisation was started by nationalists but, in fact, it was achieved by neo-colonialists. It was a long process in different forms. It was “a clutch of fitful
activities and events, played out in conference rooms, acted out in protests mounted in
city streets, fought over in jungles and mountains. Its results pleased no one” (Betts 1).
Indeed, its results were unpleasant but the USA may have liked it. Otherwise, for
colonisers, it degraded their universal status and broke their economic structures. They
found themselves trapped between the third worlds and the first worlds. For the
colonies, it became neo-colonialism under which most of them fell in chaos. Famine,
incessant coups d’état, new diseases and civil wars invaded their societies. Instead of
prospering, decolonised nations impoverished. For the globalists, it became a
repugnant burden of celebrity. The Soviets lost their colonies, their reputation and
their goal. The USA constitutional loyalty is still questioned everywhere; it has won
but its presence everywhere became and bad international omen. African Americans,
in their part, were swindled and fooled.

Consequently, denouncing the disgust of the neo-liberal capitalism in such away
while the CW was still in race was not a non-alignment. Nkrumah crossed over the
rule of everybody wins. His activities after independence did not match with American
maxims so he could not be tolerated. His international PA vision became troublesome
for the USA world domination strategy. That is why he became the target of many
assassination attempts. After the assassination of his dear friend Lumumba in 1960,
Nkrumah became overtly more adherent to communism than capitalism. He
abandoned his lucrative foreign affair with the pro-western Israel because it was an
enemy of the Casablanca Group. He set his CPP as the only party in Ghana and
himself its lifelong head. “Another significant development in the tumultuous year of
1961 was Nkrumah’s visit to the Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria,
and Albania between July and September” (Biney, Political of Nkrumah 101). All that
ensured Americans that he had become a communist. It angered them. In 1965, the
same year *Neo-colonialism* was published, which worsened everything; President Nkrumah was informed that Ghana budget was less than 500,000 pounds (Biney, *Political of Nkrumah* 95). This chocked Nkrumah as much so that he “broke down and wept” (Rooney 333). He was overthrown in 1966 with a bounty of £100,000 over his head dead or alive.

**Conclusion**

In sum, these altogether were neo-colonialism. They were colonialisms in all their facets different from the pre-WWII colonialisms. In sum all, Nkrumah called them neo-colonialism but separately each of them is a process to neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism is an indirect colonisation in which enemies and friends are undistinguishable. It is a type of colonialism in which the helpers are also exploiters. It is a colonialism in which the oppressed does not know who is his/her oppressor; a colonialism in what the colony self-sells to the coloniser or in which prosecuted will seek refuge beside persecutor; a colonialism in which the oppressor praises liberation and freedom while, at the same time, grabbing preys. Neo-colonialism is invisible.

Unquestionably, *Neo-colonialism* contains every single environmental influence on Nkrumah. Reassessing its historical background means reassessing Nkrumah’s life and Nkrumah’s epoch. As results of this historical journey, we can conclude that *Neo-colonialism* is a product of global bipolarisation race between the USSR and the USA as an evidence of Ama Biney’s claim that Nkrumah was a product of the CW. This is easy to detect in the book itself. Examples and events constituted in the book plainly are CW factors. The USA implication in the Korean War, the de Gaulle defection of the USA monopolisation of the Europe, the Vietnam War, foreign aid, war on poverty and the coup d’états are all events that occurred during the CW. But this does not
mean that *Neo-colonialism* is a narration of the bipolarisation, not at all. Contrarily, 
*Neo-colonialism* is a prediction of globalisation that occurred after the CW. Those 
events of the CW are only the factors that led Nkrumah to make this prophecy.

We, finally, come to realise why and how Nkrumah attacked the USA in *Neo-colonialism*. It was because the clash between his PA ambitions and the 
Americanisation. Nkrumah wanted to alter the international image of Africa and 
Africans in the post-WWII opportunities presented but this coincided with the 
American lust for world domination. Nkrumah vision of Africa unity was opposed by 
The CIA infiltration in Lumumba’s assassination, the CIA infiltration of Ghana 
domestic policies which led to Nkrumah’s own downfall, the American support of 
Apartheid and much more were, all, too much for Nkrumah. Viewing American 
strategies in the light of those events, Nkrumah wrote *Neo-colonialism* to predict what 
was to come: globalisation. *Neo-colonialism* is not only a prediction of globalisation it 
is also a prediction of how to be a part of this globalisation. Factors of these 
predictions are the contents of the next chapter.
Chapter Two: *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*  
*(1965) Foretold Globalisation*

**Introduction**

As we all know, one circumstance can be opportunities for many individuals or nations to realise many things. This happened in the circumstance of the WWI that brought Fascism, Nazism, Communism (Bolshevism), Socialism and Democrat Liberalism. But also, many circumstances with many opportunities can lead into only one realisation such is the case of globalisation. Bunches of circumstances and opportunities were the source of today’s globalisation. The WWII, the nationalist decolonisation and the Cold War were the eminent contexts that brought nowadays Americanised globalisation.

Globalisation is, today, the most overwhelming phenomenon apparent from every corner of our universe. Starting from the 1980s, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union and the re-union of West and East Germany, globalisation is in every world system. It is economic, political, cultural and ideological. It is in every mouth and in every medium. It seems to be haunting world politicians, economists and most particularly scholars. Thousands of televised and radio debates and documentaries are
reporting it. Thousands of books, journals, magazines and articles are dealing with all its facets from its definitions to its descriptions. This globalisation which started in the 1980s, however, was foresaid in Kwame Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* in 1965.

The focus of this chapter is to analytically detect the relationship between Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* and globalisation. Was *Neo-colonialism* really a prophecy? If so, what are the factors that make it a prediction of globalisation? If it was a prediction of globalisation, was it a pro or an anti-globalisation prediction? By answering these questions, we analyse *Neo-colonialism* in relation with some scholar sources that describe and define globalisation also in order to test the truthfulness of our Mémoire’s held thesis. Far more argument of evidences will also take into account from current events.

I. What is Globalisation?

Prior to the advent of the Cold War, there was something known as nationalism. Nationalism, in a broad sense, is a common classification of every nation trying to identify itself, politically, economically, ideologically and, especially, culturally different from any other nation. Today, this nationalism is replaced by internationalism which fuses all of these world systems into a single identity known currently as globalisation. For Nkrumah, this is neo-colonialism.

To define, according to the Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary 3rd Edition (2008), “internationalism is a state of similarity in or between countries or nations.” Globalisation is “when available goods and services, or social and cultural influences, gradually become similar in all parts of the world.” These two words can be synonym to each other. But neo-colonialism, in its turn, is the subjugation of weak
free countries under the control of powerful ones. If this is neo-colonialism, what is, then, its relation with globalisation? How Nkrumah’s Neo-colonialism can be a prediction? Nkrumah’s concern in Neo-colonialism is not lexical but it describes a world system and a fact that is also our concern about globalisation here. So what is globalisation as a system? And what did Nkrumah say about it in Neo-colonialism?

1. Globalisation as a World System

A buzzword like Globalisation escapes any single description. The term is recent. According to Larres, “Futurist John Naisbitt may have been the first to use it in his 1982 book Megatrends, but Harvard Business School professor Theodore Levitt offered the first academic analysis, emphasising business aspects” (250). As a system, its starting point is unknown and whether it ended or is still in process is also in polemic debates. In this context, Simon Reich in his “What is Globalization? Four Possible Answers” (1998) made a historical journey seeking for the roots of globalisation in the deep events of human history and ended up saying “whether causally related or not, globalisation as a period might be said to ‘succeed’ the Cold War historically” starting “from the end rather than the midst 1970s.”

Unlike Reich, George Klay Kieh, Jr set globalisation into two separate epochs in Africa and the New Globalization (2008): from 1860 to 1990 as the Old or “Victorian” Globalisation and from that date onward is the New Globalisation. He elaborates his stance by dividing the Old one into two phases. The first period ending by the WWI is named as the time of a “system of unequal exchange” because of Western slave trade and colonial exploitations without redress. The second phase started from the WWII is named as ‘neo-colonialism’ that altogether, with the first phase, “was pivotal to the development of the multifaceted crises of underdevelopment that engulfed the [African] continent” (3-7). Then, his new globalisation is the conglomereration of hyper-
interconnection between world politics, economics and cultures with “a burgeoning increase in the incidence of civil wars and their associated humanitarian crises” (13). This kind of past trip was also very necessary for Manfred B. Steger in his *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* (2003) which explains “globalisation is not a single process but a set of processes that operate simultaneously and unevenly on several levels and in various dimensions” (36).

Here Steger mentions everything related to the phenomenon globalisation. Though he said it is not a new phenomenon, he admits the rise of the capitalist America after the WWII started from the 1970s as its contemporary stage to help him elaborate the different dimensions of globalisation. Those dimensions are, for him, economic, political, cultural and ideological. However, his claim that these dimensions operate simultaneously is due to his inability to find a clear answer to “which one of them is the cause of others?” Indeed a logical question!

Coincidently, the question is explicitly answered in “The Globalisation of Human Rights” (2009) by Leslie Sklair. Sklair intrepidly makes the phenomenon an economic problem stating: “the driving force of capitalist globalisation ... [is] the culture-ideology of consumerism” (83). While this comes into accordance with Marxism, globalisation is, for some people, “one that is tied up with a Western dominated (so far) modernity more generally” (Spencer and Wollman 159). Here again, Spencer and Wollman shift from economy to ideology or culture when blaming it onto the Western world. Though, they did not finger a single nation or continent whereas the ‘West’, today, is large enough and Western modernism is also multidimensional. In the same direction but, with a little sway to respect Sklair’s claim, Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods name the “United States and its close allies” to be the drivers of the global order with their “economic liberalisation or
democratisation” (11). At last, the bold Simon Reich sub-titles “Globalization as Hegemony of American Values” which leads us into the cultural dimension of the phenomenon strengthening the claim of a French who said in 2000 that “under the effect of globalisation, the world is becoming *americanised* at the speed of the wind” (Rothschild 11). This means globalisation is americanisation.

Unsurprisingly, such a claim cannot remain untested. For this, William H. Marling investigated in 2006 the truthfulness of American’s place in globalisation in his *How “American” is Globalization?* In the book, he analyses the American cultural influences all over the world. He tackles first, the English language domination in contemporary world; its uses in commercial logos; in McDonald’s; in Hollywood films and casual speeches throughout internet. He tested the international food origins, the presence of enterprises and malls in foreign countries and the international inter-linguistics borrowing, etc. In short, he analysed all cultural elements of globalisation. Then, he admitted that the world has, in one way, been americanised. As an example he said that some “used America to project change onto the late British Empire, and critics today use Ghana or Thailand to project change onto the United States” (198). Another way, America is globalised by the world, and he illustrates his conclusion with Ohio as epitome of an America globalised.

Analytically, all mean the one and the same thing: the USA. Defenders of the economic dimension have to recognise that markets are regulated by conventional policies. Those policies are adopted on cultural mutual convictions the misunderstanding of which will endanger agreement. Such was the case between the CW competitors (capitalists and communists). The reason that led many to say that western modernity is the source of globalisation is because the western liberal capitalist democracy is seen to be modern in comparison to the soviet tyrannical social
communism. But a snake is nothing without its head; this is why the USA, as the head of the western capitalist block, is said to be today globalisation.

To synthesise, Steger’s description is more compromising but he, too, undermines what most other scholars emphasise, global security. Axiomatically, the most apparent motor of globalisation drive is the technological advances that shrink the globe into a small village. The media make possible for one from Madine-Sacko (a deep village in Mali) be aware of what is happening in Papua (New Guinea). The nowadays’ means of transportations reduce once long distances journey of years into just hours. The nuclear weapons outdate the arrows and once eminent shotguns even in the heart of the darkness:

These technologies are accelerating the movement of goods, services, ideas, and capital across national boundaries. They are also displacing traditional security threats with non-traditional worries like international terrorism, organised crime, drug trafficking, and environmental degradation while strengthening the capacity of nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) to influence policy. Tension is mounting between the fixed geography of nation-states and the non-territorial nature of global problems and their solutions (Cutter, Spero and Tyson 80-1).

This condescension of space and time results in what Roland Robertson, reports Steger, called “the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (10). This is evident internationally today. Paul Virilio identifies it as “the end of geography” (Bauman 13). Many other call it the ‘borderless world.’

If the media disseminates information all over the world, transportations globalise the world international trades and in order to save the world from
international anarchy, the global commerce has to be regulated by rules and laws. “One of the key debates about economic globalisation has been over the degree to which such a process may have undermined national economies and the power and sovereignty of nation-states” (Spencer and Wollman 160). For an international regulation, the UN’s charter was drawn.

But this charter seems to, if not to cause, help aggravate the political, social and economic disparities within as well as between countries. Sklair remarks that in most societies, at varying levels of prosperity and poverty a class system is being created with rich becoming richer and poor poorer due to the capitalist deprivation and an unprecedented insecurity (83). Objectively speaking, in theory, globalisation is supposed to foster economic, political, cultural and military trans-boundary security and equality between individuals as well between states for which reason we have international human rights, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (substituted by World Trade Organisation), Bretton Woods Institutions (IFM and World Bank), Non-governmental Organisations, etc.

Neglecting the functions of those institutions will lead to what Huntington termed in 1996 The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. In that, he highlights that people will make such a kind of in-group identification by which victims from globalisation (states as well individuals) from all over the world will unite to stand against international injustices and inequalities promoted by the western capitalist globalisation. In another way, globalisation generates fragmentation as well as unification depending on its regenerated old social class system (Spencer and Wollman 159). The lack of education, of health services and of sufficient nutrition invades most of third world and a great number of first world citizens (Rodríguez, 2004). Thus, the outcome of such a situation is anti-globalisation movements that is ‘a
must’ as would be in case of any other social danger (Kay 10). This claim of Kay indicates that people who think that globalisation is American must become, then, anti-American because their target enemy is the US’ monopoly or hegemony in this globalised world.

2. What did Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* Say about Globalisation?

Interchangeably, scholars from the ‘First World’ are mostly concerned with the term globalisation while the ones from the Third World call the same thing neo-colonialism. But, like globalisation, the starting point of neo-colonialism is debatable; however, Nkrumah’s *Africa Must Unit* in 1963 elevated its significance, while in fact, it was internationalised by his *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* in 1965. This later book contains details of what Third World people call neo-colonialism which is today similar to what is called globalisation in many ways.

First of all, globalisation is argued to be imperialism in a new form (Kieh, Globalization 107); as is said in *Neo-colonialism*. Without even referring to the remaining words of the title, Nkrumah says that neo-colonialism is “simply” imperialists’ switch of “tactics.” Again deconstructing the initial word *neo* in neo-colonialism, we can see that it means “new” form of or “re” colonisation which is comparable to Kieh’s idea that the effort of ‘new globalisation’ is to “re-colonise Africa” (7). Or with:

[the] formal dominion over a territory, like the size of the territory and the distances between territories, is in the current stage of globalisation... of little consequence for the distribution of power; under such circumstances, the right to statehood in its new, truncated version is easily obtained and gladly granted (Bauman 13).
This idea, in *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah states that once a country is or becomes independent, it is no more “feasible” to transform its status in the era of neo-colonialism. Historically, this change in the present era is explainable referring to the post-WWII international recourses for the world security. The UN, founded at that period has become the strongest international institution in today’s globalisation. It condemned colonialism all over the world in whatever form starting from 1960. Before it, the US, with the glimpse of its would-be the strongest nation economically, politically and militarily in the world, had opposed European colonial imperialism in 1942 as we have seen in the second part of the first chapter. The UN condemnation is drawn from the US ideology, which is based on a doctrinal democratic capitalist *liberalism*.

Consequently, these denunciations of colonialism were not to eradicate it but to change it. This is why Bauman refers to the *formal dominion* and that there is a “new, truncate version” of it in this global era. This formal dominion is what Nkrumah calls “Old fashioned colonialism.” In *Neo-colonialism*, this colonialism that was the instrument of imperialism has not ended ‘today’ but has been replaced by its new version, as Bauman says, which is for Nkrumah *neo-colonialism*.

Some may ask why Nkrumah said ‘today’ in 1965 while he was talking about something yet to come. That can be explained in two ways: first, Nkrumah was referring to the second half of twentieth century in which he, himself, was part of. That period coincided with the starting of globalisation, as related by many sources above. Second, as a good observer, Nkrumah, when writing his book, had already seen the end of the CW competition in which the western capitalism was to triumph. This is evident as we have said in the first chapter; this is, even, the reason of the apparition of *Neo-colonialism*. Nkrumah analysed American tactics during the hot race of the CW.
He observed the American CW strategic domination of the former European colonial powers with economic debts; the American strategic influences on the decolonising nations which were done “either with force” (like in South Vietnam, the Philippines and Cuba) or psychological “persuasions” (like the Monrovia Group in Africa). Those observations could ensure Nkrumah so that he elaborates in his book: “Since then . . . the Pentagon set about consolidating its ascendancy, evidence of which can be seen all around the world.”

However, Nkrumah did not see this ascendancy of the USA system as a good thing, but neo-colonialism in its literary meaning. As we have seen, the Cambridge dictionary defines neo-colonialism as the subjugation of a weak nation under a rich one. But, here, what makes Nkrumah’s claim global is that only the USA, the richest and head of all Western capitalists, would dominate the whole world economic sphere whereas “the economic and political aspects of Globalisation are profoundly interconnected” (Steger 62). This is why it is said in Neo-colonialism that “the essence of neo-colonialism” is to theoretically give all the international independent impression . . . or “all the outward trappings of international sovereignty” to a state while “in reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside.” It is said that in globalisation “the rules governing trade, investment, finance, and monetary order continued largely to be written by Northern [opposite to weak nations economically speaking] countries” (Hurrell and Woods 26). Here is the announcement of inequality and insecurity of both neo-colonialism as well as of globalisation.

Yet again many people, especially the pro-globalists, argue that globalisation is a natural phenomenon running by itself in which course human actions can only affect the speed but never control it. That it is happening by the magical invisible hand of
markets; as Steger asserts “the great beauty of globalisation is that it is not controlled by any individual, any government [and] any institution” (102). But Nkrumah’s opinion is just the opposite. For Nkrumah, “the foremost among the neo-colonialists is the [US]” with its “invisible” or “shadow government.” This goes well with claimants who see globalisation as American. Injustices and insecurities created by this monopoly made Nkrumah say that “neo-colonialism can and will be defeated.” Indeed the clashes of civilisations or anti-globalisation/Americanisation are apparent everywhere nowadays. From the Seattle parades, passing by the 9/11 and July 7 (7/7) bombings, to je suis Charlie one can understand something.

Finally, we can draw a comparative conclusion between “what is globalisation” and “what Neo-colonialism says it is.” To begin with, though the starting point of globalisation is a hot debate, all the related sources above put its spark to the end 1970s, i.e. the end of the Cold War. Nkrumah, also without a fixed date, says that neo-colonialism became apparent after the WWII and, specially, developed by the CW during which mass destructive weapons without responsibility made the phenomenon “a threat.” Again, Nkrumah did not openly say that the source of neo-colonialism is economic capitalism but we can implicitly detect that it is in the glimpse of the capitalist USA success over the communist USSR that made him denounce that phenomenon.

Furthermore, globalisation is divided into different dimensions as well is Nkrumah’s Neo-colonialism. As we have seen Steger set the former into four dimensions, Kieh tells us that it “is a multifaceted phenomenon with various dimensions: cultural, economic, environmental, military, political, and social, among others” (15). With the same opinion, Nkrumah found it “necessary to study, understand [and] expose” neo-colonialism with all its “subtle” guises or mechanics
which are: “not only in the economic field, but also in the political, religious, ideological and cultural spheres.”

Despite the fact that Nkrumah does not mention environmental, military and social like Kieh, he vigorously touches all of them in the book. Yet his description of these mechanics, in comparison with globalisation dimensions like economic, military, political, cultural and ideological are pretty much more similar with many globalisation references than different. The investigation on the similarity between those dimensions is what we are turning to in the next section.

II. The Mechanics of Globalisation in Neo-colonialism

1. The Economic Dimension

Apparently, the world’s economy was going very well in 1944 when the British economist John Maynard Keynes proposed the Bretton Woods system. The time this latter was operating international monetary relations is referred to as ‘the golden age of capitalism’ (Steger 38). But in 1971 the strategy of this system seemed to become an obstacle for the USA economic dominance so that President Nixon would have to seek for an alternative, which was to become the neo-liberal capitalism or neo-liberalism. This system is “politically constructed rather than predetermined” (Larres 232). By the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan, with his counterpart British Premier Margaret Thatcher “led the neo-liberal revolution against Keynesianism, consciously linking the notion of globalisation to the 'liberation' of economies around the world” (Steger 40). This neo-liberalism enhanced the international role of Bretton Woods’ institutions known as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) along with many other Non-Governmental
Organisations (NGOs) and transnational corporations (TNCs) over the seventeenth century Westphalia State system.

Accordingly, this shift in international institutions has affected the Third Word severely in the 1980s (Kieh, *Globalization* 31). The reason was that laws were prescribed in “Washington” (Hurrell and Woods 15). Instead of promoting international social and trade equality and welfarism as were their very *raison d’être*, those institutions are increasing social injustices and inequalities (Sklair 86-7). For example, Hurrell and Woods evidences this argument stating that in 1997 “it has been estimated that developing countries face tariffs of 10 percent higher than the global average, and the least-developed countries face tariffs of 30 percent higher” since those tariffs “remain so high on textiles, leather, and agricultural commodities” (18). It was this new agenda of Bretton Woods institutions that is said to drain Africa, Biney argues (*Political of Nkrumah* 178).

This situation is highly mentioned in *Neo-colonialism*. Nkrumah says that these institutions namely “International Monetary Fund, the Inter-national Bank for Reconstruction and Development (known as the World Bank), the International Finance Corporation and the International Development Association” are just few important examples founded on “U.S. capital as their major backing.” Their main goals are ensuring “Western monopolies and acting against the developing world ... inter-national capital’s control of the world market, as well as of the prices of commodities bought and sold there.” Before that, Nkrumah warned that “Unless small States come together to balance power, they must be compelled to sell their primary products at prices dictated by the developed nations and buy their manufactured goods at the prices fixed by them.” Nkrumah continues:
These agencies have the habit of forcing would-be borrowers to submit to various offensive conditions, such as supplying information about their economies, submitting their policy and plans to review by the World Bank and accepting agency supervision of their use of loans.

Here raises the problem; their loan manoeuvres with which they “use ... high rates of interest” to exploit weak countries (Asian, African and Latin American) and drive all of them into heavy debt crises. This is not a veiled fact about globalisation. The unevenness of the phenomenon is accepted by everyone. This is why even we today have sceptic globalists (the ones who accept the existence of globalisation and claim that it brings nothing good for our societies) and hyper-globalists (the ones who see globalisation as a good thing). In this account, *Neo-colonialism* can be classified in the former group. Nkrumah’s prediction in this array can just be evidenced with Hurrell and Woods’ statement that those institutions are to safeguard the US world dominance:

> as reflected in a paper written for the Bush Administration in 1992, which argued that the new order would need to account 'sufficiently for the interests of the [other] advanced industrial nations to discourage them from challenging our leadership', while also maintaining a military dominance capable of 'deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role' (28).

So how loans from such organisations can be helpful for recipient states when they are not even given on good intentions? Havidán Rodriguez asks (393). Indeed, Nkrumah notified this in his book claiming that unless “the less developed world” struggles “against external forces” they “will not become developed through the goodwill or generosity of the Developed Powers.” Steger evidenced this with IFM and
World Bank manoeuvres in South-Asia in 1997; and when the duped Argentinean President desperately announced in 2000 that “Argentina is broke, sunk, and this [neoliberal] model has swept everything away with it” (46-54). All these can tell us that even the demolition of GATT did not change great things.

Worse was on the African continent in the 1980s. Anyone with a little information about President Thomas Sankara of Burkina-Faso would know how far African debts crisis had gone in those years. Exactly, in *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah said that the “the full extent of its [neo-colonial] *inventiveness* is far from exhausted.” Apparently, as said, with many cries of economic failure from the less developed world, IFM, altogether with the World Bank invented Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) to help manage economic systems of debtor countries since they can gain and repay their debts. However, “in practice,” Steger tells us, “the terms of the programme spelled out a new form of colonialism.” Steger says that this programme is called *Washington Consensus* because the USA is dominant in the IMF and the World Bank (52-3). Fifteen years or more after the SAP introduction, “in fact, many people in these countries are poorer now than they were when their countries began the adjustment programs in the mid-1980s” (Kieh, *Globalization* 41). This shows that many people are deciphering now what Nkrumah meant by: “it is only when this contradiction is understood that the failure of innumerable ‘aid’ programmes, many of them well intentioned, can be explained.” In 2005, at an African Union (AU) summit at Sirte (Libya), the Libyan Leader Muammar Al-Kaddafi reminded his colleagues ‘had we heeded Nkrumah’s advice at that time, Africa would now be like the United States of America or at least close to it. But we did not heed his advice, and even worse we ridiculed those predictions’ (Biney, “Legacy of Nkrumah” 149).
Kieh mentions that SAP, with its parental Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and World Bank), do not invest in necessary social factors “like health creation and educations” which can alleviate the recipient poor country, but invest in social fields where only the investors profit (40-1). This was, priory, stated that “above all, neo-colonialism” (which we can substitute here with aid programmes) “postpones the facing of the social issues which will have to be faced by the fully developed sector of the world before the danger of world war can be eliminated or the problem of world poverty resolved” (Nkrumah, Neo-colonialism). Kieh goes on to fortify his claim with the case of Nigerian President’s, Dr. Chuba Okadigbo, rebuke that “IMF policy blunders and the opportunistic and perverse policies of several illegitimate military governments for placing Nigeria in its present political and economic malaise” (44). This is a really confirmation of the Nkrumah idea that the only safe aid provision for “neo-colonialist masters” is in military field that is detrimental to the recipient State.

Nkrumah also said that the aid is “another means of exploitation, a modern method of capital export under a more cosmetic name.” He justified himself with a $30, 000 millions debts collected in 1962 from developing countries out of which charges the creditor profits more than $15,000 million. It is displayed that “in 1980, the total external debt of the African countries stood at US $111,922 million” and three times more of that in 1997 (Kieh, Globalization 35). Imagine, how much would the sender benefit from that? After all, the sole cry of neo-colonialists/globalists is war on poverty, on hunger and injustice (Hurrell and Woods 16-7; Bigman 32-6). But in fact, the gap between rich and poor within and between countries is ever growing (Nkrumah, Neo-colonialism ). This is a very stronghold about globalisation and, for Nkrumah, only military aid is making this situation worse.
2. Military Dimension

Apparently, in *Neo-colonialism*, the Western or the capitalist implications in the Third World military situation was made through trade unions (labour organisations). Nkrumah illustrates this claim with the “Social Democratic parties of Europe led by the British Labour Party, and through such instruments as the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) [set at Brussels].” Respectively, in 1959, the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organisations (AFL-CIO) “fought and won” against ICFTU, which was an open pro-imperialist trade union. Since then, with its international domination, AFL-CIO set up the African-American Labour Centre (AALC) “in New York right across the river from the United Nations” in 1964 for African Americans and African nations as a symbol of domestic as well as of the US foreign anti-industrial segregation sentiment “under AFL-CIO chief George Meany and the well-known *CIA* man in labour’s top echelons, Irving Brown.”

According to Nkrumah, this AFL-CIO along with its affiliations seemed to convince other capitalists’ labour parties, of which the UK Labour Party is at head, to co-operate and expand to Africa. Their expansion set class systems on the continent: “one for drivers and mechanics in Nigeria, one in tailoring in Kenya.” It gave scholarship to Africans wanting to study trade unionism in all developed places under its influence, an example was “Austria.”

Unmistakably, an organisation headed by a CIA leader can tell us what kind of organisation the American initiated and for what purpose it is on foreign lands. Unquestionably, who says trade union says industrialisation and who says industrialisation says capitalism with its irresolvable social problems, class system (upper and lower or bourgeois and workers), racism and ethno-centrism (like the
racialist Eugenic history in the USA), sexism (like the AFL had been before it united with CIO). The trade unions are, normally, organised for the common-wealth and justice for every citizen in their existing societies. The British industrial revolution made the unionists Robert Owen and Keir Hardie internationally renowned as did the Americans Samuel Gompers and Eugene Debs whose activism brought the Clayton Antitrust Act in 1914. The effects and disorders trade unions generated in Europe and America with strikes, sabotages and boycotts are innumerable and Americans know how much they could be destructive on new nations, particularly when they are instigated by the CIA.

Bizarrely, trade unions seemed to precede industrialisation in the newly independent nations, particularly in Africa. Frantz Fanon in On Violence described this sarcastically as if underdeveloped worlds wanted to fly before learning how to walk:

As for African [labour] union members, they are making enormous progress. No sooner are they appointed to positions of leadership than they decide to group themselves into autonomous units. They do not have the fifty years' experience of labour unions in an industrialised country, but they already know that non-political unionism is an absurdity. They have not had to deal with the bourgeois bull-dozer, they have not developed a consciousness from the class struggle, but perhaps this is not required. Perhaps. We shall see that this totalising determination which often becomes a caricature of internationalism is one of the most basic characteristics of underdeveloped countries (42).

Consequently, those unionists were able to generate more than was expected. Just after the introduction of trade union in the less developed world in 1964, “Africa, Asia and Latin America have begun to experience a round of coups d’état or would-be
coup... which, from the very start, destroyed some of their best leaders (Nkrumah, Neo-colonialism). Nkrumah blamed this on the capitalist America and kept seeing with slight the indigenous old unsettled social problems. The trade unions generated a sense of egocentrism in some institutions like military in Africa; it also revived the old ethno-centrism or “tribalism” in many former colonies, particularly, in Africa. This inherent African character “of tribalism that is so much imbedded in local culture is a potentially explosive social phenomenon that was later to cause [the] civil war in Nigeria” (Wangome). Nkrumah himself has always neglected those traditional phenomena in Africa. But lateral, with the publication of his Consciencism in 1964 (1970) he tried to consolidate them to prevail ‘Africanity.’

In addition to tribalism, this trade unionism created a military awaking for self-imposition. According to Wangome, in many African countries, militaries represented the colonisers because they fought with the latter in the two world wars and colonial liberation wars, such as Dien Bien Phu. They were seen as pro-westerners reason for which they felt being unaccepted by the populations. Since many nations in Africa reached sovereignty peacefully with intellectual nationalists like Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, Julius Nyerere of Tanganyika, Siaka Stevens of Sierra Leone and many others... who were all non-military. They ridiculed military men as simple guards in the service of their countries. Nkrumah himself, in an address titled “Politics are Not for Soldiers,” openly told the cadets of Ghana military’s institution in 1961 that it was not, in any way, the duty of soldiers to interfere “with Ghana’s political affairs. Their role was not to criticise the government, but to serve it and Ghanaian people loyally” (Rahman 186). So, the militaries sought to consolidate their social status which resulted in the ‘decade of coups.’ Between 1960 and 1970, there were 27 successful coups out of 39 in alone Africa, 19 of which were in West
Africa. This was due to, as asserted by Barka and Ncube, the weak governments, political factionalism, corruption and the failure of SAP in the 1980s and cries of poverty rose from the populations. Then “the military once more took advantage of the situation and sought political power” so that, from 1960 to earlier 2012, more than 200 coups occurred in Africa; 45% were successful (3-8).

According to Nkrumah, all these troubles are due to neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialists intervene and set up in victim countries the “puppet governments” controlled by the military. To maintain those governments, the imperialists set up military bases and supply arms to indigenous “warlords” – to use Kieh’s term. Accordingly, by the end of the 1960s, there were 17 NATO bases in Africa (Nkrumah, Handbook 22). Today “NATO has been unilaterally transformed into a global police and military force by the members states without the participation of the non-member states” (Kieh, Globalization 23). NATO intervenes everywhere in the world including Africa; in this matter, the case of Libya in 2011 is eloquent. Today, from where do Al Qaeda and Boko Haram get their arms? Nkrumah said that imperialists will accuse the USSR and China (Handbook 20). In 2004, ”The U.S. has military troops in 135 [countries] or in 70% of the world's countries” (Rodriguez 392). How many American, French and British or the NATO military bases and troops do we have all over the world today?

It is argued in 2007 that NATO had 31 bases worldwide and that the USA had control over all the 191 member governments of UN; it controlled “between 700 and 800 military bases Worldwide” with personnel in more than 156 countries among which Africa alone comprises more than 800 personnel (Dufour). Nick Turse evidences Nkrumah’s idea of the invisibility and multiplicity of the American government in 2013 when he said:
In some, the US maintains bases, even if under other names. In others, it trains local partners and proxies to battle militants ranging from Somalia's al-Shabaab and Nigeria's Boko Haram to members of Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb. Elsewhere, it is building facilities for its allies or infrastructure for locals. Many African nations are home to multiple US military projects... that are already vast and will be expanding for the foreseeable future.

Seeing this malicious creativity in foreign nations in relation to the terrorist manoeuvres in western societies today, we realise why Nkrumah said that the military aid under neo-colonialism is detrimental for both, neo-colonialist and its victims. Nkrumah calls these the “limited wars;” he thinks a “world-wide war” is unlikely to happen because of nuclear weapons. Trying to avoid a nuclear war, therefore, the neo-colonialists attempt to export the social conflicts from “rich” to “poor;” from their nations to the international stage (Neo-colonialism). In his analysis, Huntington confirms Nkrumah’s words when he says that in the current world the old liberation fight is replaced by civil wars in liberated zones and that war between superpowers is improbable (33). He continues: “The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion but rather by its superiority in applying organised violence;” a fact that Westerners forget but “non-Westerners never do” (51). Indeed, that is why Nkrumah titled his book Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism, and states in it that the military aid is the last stage of neo-colonialism.

Western military aid is the outcome of global politics that undermine the national sovereignties. In 2007, the Bush administration built the USA-Africa Command (AFRICOM) in 2007 in the name of war on terror whereas Muammar Al-Qaddafi recalled in 2005 Nkrumah’s call for making an “All African Army” or stand-
by force that was never realised (Biney, *Political of Nkrumah* 181). This call by Nkrumah is pretty well accentuated in his *Africa Must Unite* with even charts of its structure drawn. His *Handbook* even aimed at creating an “All-African People's Revolutionary Army” (AAPRA) and an “Organisation of Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America” (OSPAAL) (56-7). Repeatedly, in *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah said that the only solution against neo-colonialism is unity between the “divided continent of Africa” and the “strengthening of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation.” But bizarrely, the neo-colonialists are exploiting Nkrumah’s prophecy instead of its direct audiences confirming, in fact, that their inventiveness is not really exhaustive. Or as an African idiom would say ‘the tail is wagging the dog.’

3. **The Political Dimension**

The states’ sovereignty is threatened or vice versa. This is the polemic debate between hyper-globalisers and sceptics about globalisation. It is like a “vexing version of the chicken and-the-egg problem” into political globalisation, Steger synthesises. Steger explains: hyper-globalisers support the decline of individual states’ power in global decision making while the sceptics defend “a new form of territorialisation” of nation states, i.e.; an emerging power of states (57-62). In this debate, unlike Steger’s theoretical compromise, Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism* is a resolutely interference between the two strongholds.

In *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah admits the “Western monopoly” of the world by their invented “invisible trade” mechanisms (banking systems, labour unions, international militarisation, Non-governmental Organisations, etc) and their communication means (precisely 90% control of ocean shipping) and media. But Nkrumah calls these as ‘Westerner’ because they are founded on only (if not only
American) western capitalist interest and for the exploitation of weak nations. “The question is one of power. A State in the grip of neo-colonialism is not master of its own destiny.” For him, this Western power is attained in two ways: “the subjugation of the working classes within each individual country and the exclusion of the State from any say in the control of capitalist enterprise.” And these are attained due to the rights required by international organisations like UN. Although this acceptance, Nkrumah did not undermine the power of states; on the contrary, he urges states and even individuals to react in case of any injustice.

For Nkrumah, this system of neo-colonialism is “the worst form of imperialism” because it means the irresponsibility for the ones who practice it and the “exploitation without redress” for its victims. This claim, Leslie Sklair has better elaborated. His analyses show that the UN’s charter of international Human Rights and Neo-liberal institutions (World Bank and WTO) and transnational corporations (TNCs) do not “prioritise economic and social rights” of individuals. For him, it is unconceivable that UN “asserts rights without specifying who or what has the responsibility for delivering them” (87-9). Bauman approves this opinion by saying that the “international community” lacks institutions which have loyal binding authoritative power “on consensus or matter of fact discipline in lieu of the application of force.” He asserts that “there is no international polis, and none is in sight. The United Nations intended originally to play its nearest substitute, is singularly unfit as a building-site for such a polis” (15). In fact, there is a community but it is weak due to the US refusal to join it (Kieh, Globalization 21). Like Nkrumah, Leslies as well Bauman do not lack proof about this irresponsibility of international communities.

Nkrumah highlights that neo-colonial states have no intention in developing education of weak nations or improving the “bargaining power of their workers
employed by expatriate firms, or indeed of taking any step which would challenge the colonial pattern of commerce and industry” which profits the neo-colonialists. Any nationalist challenge in this direction would “be referred to as rebels or terrorists” in which neo-colonialists “have a ready-made weapon with which they can threaten their opponents if they appear successfully;” and the war will worsen “the social misery which originally provoked it” (Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*). In this complexity Bauman calls on the paradoxical global moral and ethic “promoters” (namely the USA, the UK, and France) of “aircraft, pilots and missiles for the punitive actions against the rule breakers” to stop supplying military equipments that render “the rule-breaking feasible and increasingly plausible” under global free trade selling and buying of weapons. In this arms trade, the UK, the third after France and the USA, alone sold £9 billion worth of weapons in 1998 (26). With the doubt in Western responsibility, it is illustrated: “for example, relating to, in some countries, the responsibilities of parents to look after their children is the full weight of the law used to punish people for evading their responsibilities.” But seeing that “corporate executive, politicians, officials” placed to ensure this safety of individual and “publics, goods and services are enforced in court” are irresponsible, the author illustrates:

In a just society, I would argue, employers should be responsible for ensuring that their workers and their families have a decent standard of living, and that no one goes hungry, unsheltered, uneducated, or sick for want of resources. Increasingly, under the conditions of capitalist globalisation, it is NGOs rather than governments or businesses that are most active in pursuing and extending economic and social rights (Sklair 90).
On the contrary, Kieh does not see this like irresponsibility; rather, it is making the hegemony of Western ideology and particularly the American one. According to him, after the Cold War “Bush regime made the determination that the time was propitious for the United States to establish... [a] new world order in which it will dictate others will only obey without question... the American presence in Iraq” was a test case for this new world order (23). This case demonstrates that “a powerful state cannot be stopped by an international organisation” like the USA (Kay 18). This hegemony or irresponsibility, as for Nkrumah, is what led Lestlie to instigate that “socialist globalisation or any other alternative to capitalist globalisation will have to be created by people working together” (94). The search for this other alternative is, for Huntington, what will cause a clash of civilisations.

In the post-Cold War world, Huntington describes, “People Are discovering new but often old identities and marching under new but often old flags which lead to wars with new but often old enemies” (20). He states:

Political boundaries increasingly are redrawn to coincide with cultural ones: ethnic, religious, and civilisation. Cultural communities are replacing Cold War blocs, and the fault lines between civilisations are becoming the central lines of conflict in global politics (125).

Huntington’s claim here, we might say, was the main aim of Nkrumah’s *Neo-colonialism*. But, in fact, Nkrumah’s stance in the book is not mere prediction or theory as it is for many scholars of globalisation, including Huntington. Nkrumah’s position was a precaution; it was to thwart neo-colonialism in action by states and individuals. Firstly, his Pan-African call to make a United States of Africa was because of the cultural affinity that exists between African states and people of African descent all over the world. “When Africa becomes economically free and
politically united” in a Pan-Africanist way, the capitalist world will adjust itself just like it did in the past “to any other change in the balance of power” and imperialism will end completely. His call was not only for Africans and African descendents but for all the nations and people, even within the capitalist states, who suffer from neo-colonial imperialism. It was to fight against neo-colonialism like it was done against the old colonialism. He calls to fortify non-aligned states. For him, only potential organisational pressure can eradicate the evil of neo-colonialism:

but world pressure is not exercised by appeals, however eloquent, or by arguments, however convincing. It is only achieved by deeds. It is necessary to secure a world realignment so that those who are at the moment the helpless victims of a system will be able in the future to exert a counter pressure. Such counter pressures do not lead to war. On the contrary, it is often their absence which constitutes the threat to peace (Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*).

We can say here that what Huntington tells is happening today was what Nkrumah tried to do in the 1960s. This call of Nkrumah is crystal developed in his *Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare: A Guide to the Armed Phase of the African Revolution (1970)*. This is the extension of *Neo-colonialism*. They both emphasise on what Nkrumah calls the American psychological neo-colonialism. This psychological dimension is the combination of what are known today as cultural, ideological and technological globalisation.

4. **Psychological Dimension**

What Nkrumah accentuated the most in his *Neo-colonialism* as well as in his whole political life is the role of the propaganda. It is highly perceptible in all his works. In *Neo-colonialism*, Nkrumah describes every dimension of neo-colonialism
with its propaganda which is, for him, the driving force behind the American ideological influence of liberal democracy.

First of all, Nkrumah arranges his order from economy to military. He exposes the American system of economic assistance for the trapped sovereign Latin American States and for the devastated European nations. With the reconstruction of the latter, the USA made its capitalist bloc with the slogan of liberalism that was to fall onto decolonising nations. “So it claims, that it [collective neo-colonialists] is ‘giving’ independence to its former subjects, to be followed by ‘aid’ for their development” under the cover of international welfarism. This welfarism is embedded in the slogan that “the developed nations should effectively assist the poorer parts of the world.” Then the neo-liberals advised developing countries “to liberalise and deregulate their economies so as more fully to exploit opportunities in a global world economy” (Hurrell and Woods 17). The truth was that the less developed worlds were asked to liberalise their economy to be exploited, instead of exploit, in the global economy.

As the market was failing the developing world, the micro/macroeconomics help programmes were drawn. Then, illiteracy of populations and un-democracy of governments were blamed on the un-developed worlds and they had to be solved. Thus, the solution was the pouring of labour unions, Peace Corps, Washington consensus and the Bretton Woods Institutions (IMF, WTO, World Bank and SAP). Once these introduced, resistant leaders would have to be eliminated and succeeded by a “puppet government... hence, the imperative need to depend on a foreign power for military assistance merely to keep the neo-colonised government physically in power” (Nkrumah, Handbook 15). Then, the safeguards are NATO, CIA, FBI, and specially the US Moral Re-Armament (MAR)... “supplying of ‘advisers’ of one sort or
another;” sometimes with a number of rights or demands (Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*). But these military bodies are not unknown on foreign lands.

Effectively, these guards are well known due to the psychological propaganda: the media. Nkrumah asserts that “psychological brainwashes are made through the agency of broadcasting stations like the BBC, Voice of Germany, and above all, Voice of America” showing documentaries, interview or information “programmes at all hours of the day and night, on all wavelengths and in many languages, including special English” (*Handbook 17*). Furthermore, “one has only to listen to the cheers of an African audience as Hollywood’s heroes” of CIA or FBI types “slaughter red Indians or Asians” and even a socialist propaganda, in the form of a trade unionist or a dark skin “to understand the effectiveness of this weapon” (Nkrumah, *Neo-colonialism*). Indeed, the American satellite channels are convincing about this idea today.

Hollywood itself, today, is imperialism. According to Marling, in 1949 the “U.S. studios produced only 19 films abroad, but by 1969 that number reached 183 films” (23). Culturally, more people talk today about Hollywood and not about consumer goods like Coca-Cola; “American control of the global movie, television, and video industries even exceeds its dominance of the aircraft industry;” in 1993, it produced 88% of the international movies (Huntington 58). Effectively, to well understand what Nkrumah means by CIA type heroes, one has to see Agent Jack Bauer in the series *24 Hours Chronos*. These, Nkrumah calls fictional media that psychologically blackmail the likely ‘enemy’. He explains: “upon reading it, the fainthearted might come to feel that they must give up in despair before such an array of apparent power and seemingly inexhaustible resources.” But historical revolutions, he ensures us, taught us more about this; as examples, the American Revolution itself with the Russian and
Chinese ones which in their time people were not asking “if” but “when” they would win in order to succeed. Also Algeria and Vietnam could be examples (Neo-colonialism).

“While Hollywood takes care of fiction, the enormous monopoly press, together with the outflow of slick, clever, expensive magazines, attends to what it chooses to call news,” Nkrumah states in Neo-colonialism. Or with details, he states “The paper war penetrates into every town and village and into the remotest parts of the ‘bush.’ It spreads in the form of free distributions of propaganda films praising the qualities of western civilisation and culture;” protected with guns (Handbook 17). Moreover, their “Jehovah’s Witnesses” missionaries were convincing people in many developing countries “to not salute their new flags” (Neo-colonialism). Supporting this idea, Steger puts that “media enterprises secure not only the undisputed cultural hegemony of popular culture,” they also cause “depoliticisation of social reality and the weakening of civic bonds” (81). Today, the unceasing civil wars and factionalism can back this claim.

Worse, those media are installed in foreign countries because international laws allow it. Nkrumah cites many examples amongst which he ranks the US Information Agency (USIA) as “the chief executor of [the] US psychological warfare” which the US might have been sworn to spread all over the world in whatsoever cost or means. The USIA had hundreds of radio stations, more than two hundreds cinemas with more than three hundred “film libraries.” Nkrumah details that “the USIA boasts more than 120 branches in about 100 countries, 50 of which are in Africa alone” glorifying “the US while attempting to discredit countries with an independent foreign policy.” It prevents the spread of foreign national media; it also “collects secret information with special reference to defence and economy, as a means of eliminating its international
military and economic competitors.” And finally the USA ensures its full liberty and monopoly everywhere. The Radio Française Internationale (RFI) is its francophone counterpart today. The alternative of this neo-colonial propaganda today is called ‘public diplomacy in the western nations.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has tried to test the relationship between globalisation and Kwame Nkrumah’s book *Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism* published in 1965. Through our analysis, we started with a short lexical definition of globalisation and neo-colonialism, then we moved to describe both as concepts and social systems. But while we concentrated on globalisation in general, our concern with neo-colonialism was just with Nkrumah’s book. The research thesis was that this book of Nkrumah was a prediction of globalisation.

The feasibility of the research was proved by highlighting the starting epoch of the two concepts. Both, globalisation and neo-colonialism seem to have started after the WWII, during the Cold War, and continue to the present day. However, this starting time is conflicting about globalisation but the commonly accepted is that it started in the 1980s and especially after the fall of Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union in 1990. As *Neo-colonialism* was published in 1965, the prediction is totally probable. After this proved, we analysed *Neo-colonialism*, to detect the main characteristics of globalisation that could be predicted.

The findings showed the existence of many similarities but also with limitations in prophecy. For examples, the unevenness of globalisation, its social injustices as well as its problem of security are apparent in Nkrumah’s book. Most importantly, the different dimensions/mechanics of globalisation are all present in *Neo-colonialism*
either explicitly or implicitly. There is a very coherent prediction of economic, political and military globalisation and their inter-linkages. But admittedly, there is some void in the thesis claim.

Cultural globalisation is very detailed in the book. However, some of the main core of this dimension that makes the claim that cultural globalisation is an American imperialism is missing like McDonalds’ restaurants or cultural foods in general. More, although the media is there, the music is missing. Also, we have seen media powers well-described but again internet is not mentioned at all but the those media psychologically defeat us is evident with one our teacher of civilisation claim that it is impossible to fight or to change the injustice of globalisation or American domination. The environmental, though not well-developed, is present too as seen in de Gaulle’s contempt in the Sahara desert while testing his nuclear weapons. These are very important elements of today’s globalisation that are discussed in sources dealing with its cultural side. Because of all these, Neo-colonialism is really a prophecy and not just a regional one; it is an international prophecy.
General Conclusion

That man is what his environment made him to be is incontestable when looking at Nkrumah’s historical career. Nkrumah’s time met with the need of martyrs in Africa and amongst Africans all over the world. So, instead of volunteering to be one, he was made one. The universal white supremacy, if not Anglo-Saxon only, had a burden to imperialise, colonise, racialise or ‘civilise’ the world. Blacks were dehumanised and non-Westerners exploited without redress. The non-capitalists were vilified in the interest of capitalist colonial and neo-colonial imperialism. Nkrumah was born when Ghandi was fighting against these in India, Garvey and Du Bois in America, James Kwegyir Aggrey and S. R. Wood in Gold Coast, Nnamdi Azikiwe in Nigeria, I. T. A. Wallace Johnson in Liberia and Lenin in Russia. So he was born in revolution.

Grown up, in the USA, Nkrumah was exposed to works of Western thinkers, pro-imperialists like Hegel, Hugo, Herbert Spencer, David Hume and many others as well as anti-imperialists like Mazzini, Karl Marx, Engel and Voltaire. Some others like Machiavelli, Rousseau, Descartes and Kant questioned how people can/cannot support such an idea; they questioned human morality. Then in 1945, he moved to London where he entered in contact with the practical philosophy of Pan-African activists like Du Bois, Kenyatta and specially the Martinique George Padmore, his mentor. Two years later, Nkrumah was totally transformed into an intrepid nationalist devoted to the total liberation of Africa and African people and the formation of a United States of Africa. He succeeded in accelerating African independence and making of the
Organisation of African Unity in the 1960s but never, yet, an African intergovernmental unity that was his innermost Pan-African dream.

Pursuing this devotion, Nkrumah held conferences, delivered speeches, and wrote books and pamphlets. Amongst his works, Neo-colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism (1965) came to be seen as a prophecy about today’s globalisation that emerged in the 1980s dominated by Western capitalism and headed by the USA. Saying that this book contains an unmistakable hostile charge against the American Government is true because Neo-colonialism is a denunciation of the superpower US bilateral race during the Cold War and its catalytic play between colonisers and colonised during decolonisation. But, what is not true is the Department of State’s claim that the book is fundamentally anti-Western or anti-American. This claim led us to analyse Neo-colonialism in the light of globalisation. Our analysis confirmed that the former was a prediction of the latter.

Despite the absence of some indispensable elements of globalisation in Neo-colonialism like internet and McDonald’s Restaurants or Fast foods and music, the findings show that the book has really predicted what scholars today call globalisation. The only difference between them seems to be terminological. What most Westerners or Universalists call globalisation or internationalisation is what most scholars from the Third World, especially those from old colonial zones, call neo-colonialism. Otherwise, the analysis shows that today’s globalisation theories and events are just corroboration of what was said and intended in Neo-colonialism.

Actually, globalisation is said to be imperialism as well as neo-colonialism. Globalisation is “American” as tested by Marlin and confirmed by Simon as American hegemonies. Neo-colonialism said that the USA is at the forefront of neo-colonialism.
Globalisation is the economy that allows the ever-widening gap between the ‘haves and have-nots;’ globalisation is military, political and psychological as is said exactly in *Neo-colonialism*. The global call to fight against the global injustices and insecurities or irresponsibility that is generating the “clash of civilisations” is just the confirmation of Nkrumah words that “the danger to world peace springs not from the action of those who seek to end neo-colonialism but from the inaction of those who allow it to continue.” Evidently, the Seattle Parade movement, the 9/11, the 7/7 and *je suis Chalie* or even the environmentalist movements might be contemporary applications of this idea and confirm that neo-colonial/global political-economic-military aid with its injustices is not good for none of its actors.

But, these anti-globalisation movements are not the confirmation of *Neo-colonialism* being a prediction of anti-globalisation. This claim would be like backing the idea that the book is an anti-Western or anti-American which is a misunderstanding. On the contrary, Muammar Qaddafi’s resurrection of Nkrumah’s “prediction” in 2005 was just telling us that Nkrumah was trying to imitate the United States of America with a United States of Africa. Qaddafi was, then, trying to convince other African leaders to come into a governmental union or at least make an African military force as is the aim of all Nkrumah’s political works, including *Neo-colonialism*.

The Kenya revolutionary fiction writer, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, in his 1977 novel *Petals of Blood* said that Nkrumah had eagle eyes. In the 18th May 2015, Robert Mugabe in the peace agreement in the Malian case reminded us the genius of Nkrumah’s call for unity. All these are the realisations of what the eminent Nkrumah preached years ago that become apparent today. This can be justified by one of the Marxist explanations that the structure of human society is like a brick wall. Some
bricks are laid down to secure the basement while others are superposed over the basement in order to secure the purpose of the wall. But, just the way the bricks at the peak of the wall are visible in distance than lower ones, Nkrumah was at the peak in his time. Being endowed with humanity, unlike the bricks, he could see far away into the future that most of his contemporaries could not.

But unlike the divine prophets, Nkrumah was like a fortune-teller from his observation of the past; not a divine revelation. This past was not a far long one; it was the USA’s successful history. The Union of the Thirteen Colonies, the League of Nations, the United Nations, NATO and the EU were all references through which Nkrumah perceived the future and wanted to avoid an African or a Third World loss in that future that would come. This is why we assert that Neo-colonialism was not an anti-American/Western call. Rather, it was an American kind of union call, like Europeans did in the same situation, because the globalisation era is an American era and the American era is the era of union. All these can show us that the book was and still is just about why Africans and all the victims under unjust globalisation must unite to secure a just future.

Paradoxically, no-one is supposed to voluntarily imitate the USA without its consent and this consent depends on its advantage solely. Nkrumah’s call for the creation of an All-African People's Revolutionary Army (AAPRA) and Organisation of Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America (OSPAAL) in Africa Must Unite and especially in his Handbook and Neo-colonialism, for example, has never been materialised until George W. Bush’s war on terror has built the United States Africa Command (USAFRICOM or AFRICOM). This means that instead of Africans exploitation of Nkrumah’s prophecy, the neo-colonial did it in its favour. Not surprising, if an African Union or the advance of Non-Aligment or even the Soviet
Union were not in the benefit of the USA, they were to be opposed and dismantled. *Neo-colonialism* said it but in different words: that the evil of neo-colonialism is that it prevents the formation of those large units. This is true when the union would be an obstacle for American interests.

To conclude, if the local dream of Martin Luther King, Jr. in just America took a long forty-five years to come true, then we can hope that the African dream of Kwame Nkrumah about a United States of Africa or a united force of the Third World is to come true one day. We have to be optimistic about this because we are witnessing the realisation of some of his ideas like the move of the Organisation of African Unity to a new African Union vision in 2002 and many Asian and Latin American states are requiring the AU membership today. Again, even though it is under the US leadership, the AFRICOM is a move toward Nkrumah’s call for making an African united force and also an African currency, AFRO, is expected in 2023. These are proofs that we are learning from the mistakes of our ancestors and that Nkrumah died but his ideas are still among us as long as they are inked on pages like *Neo-colonialism*. 
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