Chapter 8

**Neocolonialism and Contemporary Socio-political Scenario**

This chapter explores, among other issues, the prophetic nature of Fanon’s observations on neocolonialism, the contemporary relevance of his theories, and the impact of Fanonism as such on various spheres of modern life.

If colonialism was the concerted move of the imperial rulers to subjugate other nations through military conquest, and then, to impose political, economic and cultural control over them, neocolonialism primarily aims at the economic dependence of the newly liberated countries on the former colonizers. In other words, as Philip Altbach observes, “Modern neocolonialism differs from traditional colonialism in that it does not involve direct political control, leaving substantial leeway to the developing country”. Altbach further says that “Neocolonialism is partly a planned policy of advanced nations to maintain their influence in developing countries, but it is also simply a continuation of past practices” (“Education and Neocolonialism” in Ashcroft et al ed. The Post-Colonial Reader, 452-56). As Fanon observes, while granting formal independence to any newly ‘liberated’ country, the former colonizer “wrings from it an economic dependence which becomes an aid and assistance program” (TAR 121). Fanon’s predictions on neocolonialism in The Wretched of the Earth and Toward the African Revolution have been proved to be
perfectly true when analyzing the neocolonialist encroachments of the former colonizers and the highly industrialized countries on the developing and underdeveloped countries of the world.

Most often it is the will of the nationalist bourgeoisie to come to friendly agreement with colonialism which paves the way for neocolonialism, once the country attains a ‘fragment of independence’. Whenever this attitude of the indigenous bourgeoisie is questioned by the intellectual elements of the nationalist party, as Fanon observes, these elements are branded as “adventurers and anarchists” (WE 95). As a consequence, colonialism makes further advances to the nationalist moderates. Eventually, the ‘illegal minority’ that warned against the machinations of the colonizers, “finds itself in a historic blind alley”, as Fanon puts it (WE 100). As Fanon predicted in *The Wretched of the Earth* in 1961, most of the Third World countries, after they obtained formal independence, began to send out “frenzied appeals for help to the former mother country” (WE 120). And these appeals in turn hastened the neocolonialist maneuvers of the former colonizers. The national bourgeoisie by then becomes the real “intermediary type” as they are “not engaged in production, nor in invention, nor building, nor labour . . .” as Fanon observes (WE 120). Their mission, according to Fanon, “consists, prosaically, of being the transmission line between the nation and a capitalism rampant though camouflaged, which today puts on the masque of neocolonialism” (WE 122). The upsurge of neocolonialism, and its
offshoot, neoliberalism today in the Third and Fourth World countries, is by and large the result of the ‘cheap-jack’s function’ played by the indigenous bourgeoisie of the formerly colonized countries. It is on account of the role of the national bourgeoisie as the ‘manager of Western enterprise’ that the Third and Fourth World countries have become the virtual brothels of Europe. Unlike the European bourgeoisie, who are very dynamic, educated, and secular, the indigenous bourgeoisie, the “get-rich-quick middle class” are only the “caricature” of the Western bourgeoisie (WE 141). Hence the former colonizer could very easily manipulate the weakness of the native bourgeoisie.

Fanon’s prediction that the national economies of those counties which are governed by the indigenous bourgeoisies after formal independence would be literally controlled by the neocolonialists has wholly been proved through the remarkable influence of the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization (WTO), and now, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) – agencies virtually controlled by either the former imperial rulers, or the highly industrialized countries – euphemistically called the agents of Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization. For, as Fanon remarked in The Wretched of the Earth, “The budget is balanced through loans and gifts, while every three or four months the chief ministers themselves, or else their governmental delegations come to the erstwhile mother countries or elsewhere, fishing for capital” (WE
The only difference is that, in the new millennium, the international monetary agencies have a greater say in the global fiscal affairs than the former mother countries. Thus, neocolonialism has proved itself to be "a new, subtler, but perhaps equally influential, kind of colonialism" as Philip G. Altbach observes ("Education and Neocolonialism", in Ashcroft et al 1995, 452-56).

Olufemi Taiwo considers Fanon as a prophet of neocolonialism in the true sense of the term. For he says: "Like a seer, Fanon peered into the future of the newly independent countries". Taiwo further adds that "Fanon had been a dissenting voice in the chorus of enthusiasm that greeted the advent of flag independence... Like a seer Fanon the dissenter had peered into the future and left us a legacy of forebodings about how precarious that future—our present—might be". Taiwo, in his enthusiasm for Fanon, goes to the extent of saying that "Fanon the prophet was able to issue his Issiah like warning of future unhappy consequences" ("On the Misadventures of National Consciousness: A Retrospect on Frantz Fanon's Gift of Prophecy" in Gordon et al 255-70).

Today neocolonialists resort to all kinds of heinous measures, including military might, to subjugate the countries which either refuse to follow their dictates, or pose a potential threat to their economic and military superiority. Therefore, "The essence of neocolonialism", as Lufti El Kholi observes, "is to ensure formal political independence while securing actual subordination to
imperialism, especially economically” (“Anti-imperialist Struggle in Africa at the Present Stage”. in Africa: National and Social Revolution 19-41). According to him, neocolonialists ensure the subordination of the newly independent countries through economic, political, military and ideological means. Kholi is of the view that neocolonialism is not hostile to the political, economic and social ambitions of the indigenous bourgeoisie of the countries wherever a fragment of independence has achieved. The neocolonialists will see to it that the power of the national bourgeoisie is consolidated to make it a force sufficiently strong enough to prevent the prospect of any kind of national revolution leading to socialism. For, the national bourgeoisie of the newly independent countries, as Che Guevara observes, is “a parasitic bourgeoisie that adds nothing to the national wealth of their countries but rather deposits its huge ill-gotten profits in capitalist banks abroad, and makes deals with foreign countries to reap more profits with absolute disregard for the welfare of the people” (Global Justice 23). In other words, the neocolonialists do not like the all round development of the newly liberated countries.

The developments in Algeria in the 1980s confirm Fanon’s fear regarding the possibility of the former colonial power tightening its control over the economy of the newly liberated countries. Though Algeria could make considerable progress in tune with the political agenda of the FLN to bring about the much desired socialist revolution, by the 1980s, the country once gain became economically
dependent on France. The opening up of the Algerian economy to certain types of limited foreign investments, expanding and revitalizing the country's private sector in both agricultural and consumer industries were the measures in this regard initiated by the Algerian government under President Chadli Benjedid in the early 1980s. These were the first indications of Algeria falling a prey to neocolonialist powers. John P. Entelis observes that diversifying arms purchases away from the Soviet Union and toward such Western manufacturers as Britain and the U.S., and lowering of Algeria's once highly visible profile in global and Third World affairs, were the other steps taken by the Chadli government favouring neocolonialist forces.

The pre-eminence of the language of the oppressor also could be visible in Algeria in the 1980s, because 'French language competence' was considered as essential in scientific and other needs of the Algerian society. Moreover, the enormous state machinery of Algeria still uses the French language for its functioning. According to Entelis, "a curious love-hate relationship continued between the Algerian elites and French culture, language and society" (Entelis 96).

The periodic and unilateral French embargo on the import of wine from Algeria is one of the several moves initiated by France to strangle the new Algerian nation since 1970. Algeria being a predominantly Muslim country had no market for alcohol since its independence in 1962. And the French very well know that wine is
perishable, and its lack of sale would cause considerable loss and other problems for the Algerian people.

As already mentioned, the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, and the Asian Development Bank are the agents of neo-liberal globalization, the advanced stage of neocolonialism. A close study of the impact of these agencies on the underdeveloped and developing countries of the world is imperative for a better understanding of the magnitude of Fanon's predictions on neocolonialism. When established in 1944, the IMF was motivated by the concept of providing temporary assistance to correct the balance of payment problems of its member countries. The World Bank which was founded in the same year aimed at the long term project funding for reconstruction of the developing countries after the Second World War, and the eventual growth and development of these countries. But, in due course of time, several restrictions like trade liberalization, devaluation of currencies, removal of food subsidies and the overall Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) imposed by the IMF and the World Bank virtually crippled the economies of the underdeveloped and developing countries. The General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), a global trade organization, established in 1947, also was instrumental for the decline of the economies of these countries. In fact, The WTO, founded in 1995, is the true successor organization of the GATT. The neoliberal revolution, initiated by Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Regan, the former British Prime Minister and American
President respectively, further boosted the neoliberal globalization moves. Neoliberalism received further impetus with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989-91.

In return for the much needed loans from the IMF and the World Bank, the developing countries are forced to implement the Structural Adjust Programme, otherwise known as the 'Washington Consensus'. The professed aim of the SAP is to reform the internal economic mechanisms of the debtor countries of the developing world so that they would be in a better position to pay the debts they had incurred. But, in practice, the SAP turned out to be a new form of colonialism. As Manfred B. Steger observes, "large portions of the development loans granted by these institutions have either been pocketed by authoritarian political leaders or have enriched local businesses and the Northern corporations they usually serve" (Globalization: A Very Short Introduction 53). Moreover, mandatory cuts in public spending, reduced educational opportunities, environmental pollution caused by the factories installed by transnational companies in the debtor countries, become the stumbling blocks in the way of poverty alleviation and socially sustainable programmes of the developing countries. Besides, statistics reveal that the largest share of the national budgets of the developing countries is spent on servicing outstanding IMF/World Bank debts. For example, in 1997, the developing countries paid a combined 292 billion dollars in debt services, while received only 269
billion dollars as new loans (Steger 53-54). The UN Human Rights Commission’s 1999 resolution stipulates that the SAP programmes and economic reforms must not tell upon the basic rights to food, housing, clothing, work, education, medical care and healthy environment of the people of an indebted country. A situation which compels the population of a country to forgo the above mentioned rights due to the indebtedness of the country is a specific instance of the violation of the principles of self-determination of peoples in general, as envisaged in the UN Charter. In spite of these factors, the international monetary agencies like the IMF and the World Bank are extracting enormous amounts towards the SAP, now renamed with the euphemism, Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme (PRSP). As long as the United States enjoys the veto power in the decision making of the IMF and the World Bank, it can block any decision of these institutions even though the other more than 180 member countries want to go forward with the decision. How best the IMF and the World Bank can cripple the economies of developing countries is borne out in the Argentinean experience. In the early 1990s the IMF and the World Bank officials hailed Argentina as a ‘model developing country’. But by June 2000, the Argentinean economy crippled beyond recovery, thanks to “the stronger austerity measures in return for new loans” (Steger 54). The experience of Argentina and several other countries of the world have proved Fidel Castro’s observation on the IMF to be quite true. For, in Castro’s opinion, “The assistance of the
International Monetary Fund is like the Devil's kiss" (Castro 32). Che Guevara also used to raise strong objections to the newly liberated countries falling preys to the IMF conditions. According to him, “the IMF acts as the custodian of the dollar for the capitalist world” (Global Justice 7). However, following the model set by Fidel Castro and Hugo Chavez, Argentina too has proved that the dollar is not that all-mighty, as the Bush regime believes it to be. For, in the first week of Jan. 2006, Argentina took the very bold step towards self-reliance by canceling its debt facility with the IMF. Such a move was indeed motivated by the harsh realization that the long term indebtedness that resulted in massive unemployment, rocketing poverty, and the unprecedented banking collapse was due to the IMF imposed conditions on Argentina.

Quoting data from the United Nations Human Development Report, Manfred B. Steger drives home the fact that the poorest countries of the world have become drastically poorer over a period of 25 years. For, Steger tells us that “before the onset of globalization in 1973, the income ratio between the richest and poorest countries was at about 44 to 1. Twenty-five years later, it had climbed to 74 to 1” (Steger 105).

Another shocking factor is that the IMF and the World Bank charge very higher rates of interest for the loans borrowed by the developing countries when compared to the remarkably low rate of interest for the loans granted to the highly industrialized countries.
According to the UNDP study, as quoted by Eric Toussaint in *Globalisation: 'Reality, Resistance & Alternatives*', "During the 1980s, while interest rates were 4% in the highly industrialized countries, the effective interest rate paid by developing countries was 17%" (Toussaint 13). At the beginning of the new millennium, the crisis caused by this kind of policy on the part of the IMF is quite alarming. The Third and Fourth World countries are even now paying a very higher rate of interest for their loans than the countries of the North. Moreover, the countries of the North and the European Union have been trying to strangle the economies of the South through their unholy trade tactics. Consequently, the majority of the countries of the South export raw materials and low-value-added manufactured goods to the North, and in turn import high-value-added industrial goods and technology. Eric Toussaint exposes The European Union's protectionism against the South by citing the specific example of the European Commission's authorization to the European chocolate makers to substitute fat for cocoa butter (which is a produce of the South). The net result is a sharp fall in the price of cocoa on the world market, and the consequent severe poverty of the cocoa farmers of the South.

Similarly, through the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), coming within the frame work of the WTO, the countries of the North, especially the U.S., are trying further to subjugate the countries of the South. The story of the Indian 'Basmati'
rice is a good case in point. This ancient variety of high quality rice, the result of centuries of labour of Indian farmers, has now become the intellectual property of the Texas based Rice Tec, thanks to the validation of its patent by the U.S. Office of Patents. TRIPS is also instrumental in the creation of 'sterile' varieties of seeds (that is, the seed from the harvest of one season cannot be used for the following season, each batch of seeds losing its genetic characteristics with each harvest), and the monopoly of producing herbicides by the same multinational companies. Apart from its adverse economic effect on the people of the South, the intellectual property rights, in the long run, will tell upon the biodiversity of the entire earth. The patent issue is all the more alarming when we take into account the fact that 97% of the world's trade patents are held by the highly industrialized countries of the world and that 90% of the technology and invention patents are the property of the Multi-national Companies. The supremacy and the double standard adopted by the U.S. in these matters, especially in the pharmaceutical fields, have been exposed by Eric Toussaint with specific examples. "The USA under George W. Bush", Toussaint says, "is amongst the most savage defenders of the interests of the pharmaceutical laboratories" (Toussaint 27). He cites how the Bush administration obliged the transnational company, Bayer, to halve the price of Cipro, the antibiotics to treat anthrax, when America was gripped by that disease in October 2001. Whereas, in November 2001, at Doha WTO meet, the Bush government
blockaded the right of the countries of the South to produce certain life-saving medicines – medicines to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. That this blockade was against Article 25 of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees every citizen of the world, among other things, the right to medical care, drives home the sheer hollowness of Bush’s talk about human rights and democracy.

The Asian Development Bank, virtually the Asian extension of the Word Bank, has more or less the very same neoliberal agenda of the IMF and the World Bank. Just as America has the veto power in the IMF and the World Bank, being the possessor of the bulk of the shares in these agencies, Japan enjoys the equivalent power in the ADB. The interference of the ADB in the socio-political and planning spheres of its member countries is a tacit move to control the economies of the underdeveloped and developing countries. In the name of its Stable City Development Programme, the ADB is making inroads even into the Left Democratic Front ruled city corporations of Kerala. The professed objective of the ADB is to encourage privatization ‘to bring about development, and to eradicate poverty’. The Argentinean experience with the IMF/World Bank in the 1990s exposes the hollowness of such schemes. Those who are aware of the ADB agenda very well know that drinking water, health care, consumer goods, education etc. would be controlled by the ADB’s market-oriented economy concept. It is a foregone conclusion that the ADB will not give anything for nothing. To cite a small example, in
Kerala’s case, ADB’s proposal to install meters for public taps, and to form ‘tap committees’ to monitor the consumption of water from the public taps, are not definitely to help the underprivileged people who have been enjoying the benefits of free drinking water for decades. It is a plain fact that the ADB is not all concerned about the socio-political issues its ‘assistance’ may create in the indebted countries.

The much acclaimed Official Development Assistance (ODA) which the developing countries receive from the North is meagre. What is all the more shocking is the fact that all the money provided through ODA returns to the rich countries in exchange for products purchased by them. The Third World countries in general, and India in particular have signed agreements with the countries of the North to buy F16 aircrafts and other armaments which are outdated as far as the countries of the North are concerned. Countries like India become dupes of the Multi-national Companies and the armament producers of the North while accepting what can be termed ‘the clearance sale programme’ of the countries of the North. Curiously enough, the ODA and the other assistances are adjusted against the purchase of these outdated armaments and aircrafts. What the countries of the North do in turn, is to produce and amass new generation weapons of war at the expense of the Third World countries. In short, as Eric Toussaint remarks, ODA is usually “tied aid” (Toussaint 43). He further observes that “The more arms a Third World country buys, the more aid it receives” (Toussaint 49). Hence
there is no surprise in Israel and Saudi Arabia, which receive the most U.S. ODA, spend the major portions of this aid on arms. Herein lies the irony of certain tall declarations relating to arms deals made by the U.S. President Bush during his March 2006 visit of India.

Fanon’s warnings against multinationals and cartels in 1961 turns out to be highly prophetic when we realize that Lockheed Martin, the chief sponsor of George Bush for his election campaigns, is the company which manufactures F16 aircrafts. It is no wonder then that the U.S. Committee for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Expansion was presided over by the Vice-President of Lockheed Martin. If the campaign of Bush all over the world for arms sale goes in the present pace, the U.S. will be selling more than 90% of the weapons of mass (WMDs) destruction to the world at large within another year. It was the very same Bush who had propagated lies about the presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) in Iraq. Apart from America's objective of taking possession of the vast oil reserves of Iraq, it is now clear that Bush had the very personal agenda of making use of the armaments of his sponsors in the war on Iraq. It is the very same agenda which motivates the U.S. in aiding and abetting the atrocities unleashed on the Palestinians by the Israeli government.

It is very painful and shocking to note that, thanks to their losing credibility, the trade union movements and the left-wing parties are no longer seen as the legitimate representatives of the labourers of
the world as such. In a way, the established trade unions and left-wing parties were also indirectly responsible for the Bastille Appeal for the Cancellation of the Third World Debt in 1989. The Bastille Appeal was a stark reminder of the reality that in spite of all the conditions for happiness existed in the world of the 1980s, the highest growth rate was that of poverty. Even in the new millennium things have not changed for the better. Even today hunger kills tens of thousands of children all over the Third World, especially in the African countries.

In the early 1950s, when Sartre declared that “poverty is the best distributed thing in the world: we are not short of wretched people” (Colonialism and Neocolonialism 20), not only the people of the Third World, but even the Europeans were shocked. But, today, I am sure, the neoliberals will not get scandalized when they watch in the mini screens of their drawing rooms the reports of thousands of children in the Third World countries dying of malnutrition and starvation. For, the new millennium neoliberals have developed the teeth to turn a callous face to these kinds of developments in the Third World countries, and elsewhere in the world. Today, everyone knows that it is the economic imperialism of the highly industrialized rich countries of the world that bleeds the Third World. This is all the more true of Africa. For, as Walter Rodney observes, “international capitalist system . . . has been the principal agency of underdevelopment of Africa over the last five centuries” (Preface. Rodney 70). Hence the all the more relevance of the exhortation made by Fanon in 1961 for
reparation on the part of the former colonizers. Now the wretched of the earth have realized that only solidarity among the peoples of the world can break the power of economic imperialism. Though the cancellation of the Third World debt will not solve all the problems of the people of these countries, it is an indispensable precondition to any far-reaching solution to the problems faced by the people of the Third World. The demand for debt cancellation becomes quite legitimate when we take into account the reality that a major share of the Third World debt is 'odious debt', that is, debts contracted against the interests of the people of a country by despotic governments. Debts contracted by legal and legitimate regimes under the SAP, and detrimental to the interest of the people, are also odious debts. Moreover, the principles of the international law, 'force majeure' (meaning, one cannot do the impossible), acknowledges that a change in the conditions of a contract may render it invalid. To the debt crisis of the Third World countries of today, this law is morally applicable. For, the dramatic rise in the interest rates imposed by the IMF and the World Bank, and the considerable drop in export prices for the Periphery countries in the 1980s, were caused by the instigation of the creditor countries. Hence the relevance of 'force majeure' in debt-cancellation call. Besides, the UN International Law Commission does not approve of repaying the loan at the risk of jeopardizing the education, law system and public services of the country in question.
In several African countries, life expectancy is dramatically falling as a consequence of abject poverty. Yet, the IMF and the World Bank still insist on imposing SAP to pay for their debts. The only apparent change is on the level of discourse. For, as indicated earlier, we now hear of Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme (PRSP), instead of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). To obtain the much acclaimed assistance under the PRSP, low income countries have to set out their development priorities, abide by the economic and trade policies such as privatization, deregulation and trade liberalization. In fact, nine out of ten poverty reduction programmes demand privatization. The disastrous effects of the IMF/World Bank assisted 'flagship' water system privatization in Tanzania as part of the conditions of PRSP in 2003, drive home the fact that what the Third World countries get from the IMF/World Bank is the same old wine in new bottles. In India, the World Bank sponsored privatization of power generation and supply in the Orissa state in 1999, virtually put the state into a debt trap from which it will not be able to recover in the immediate future. Besides, half of Orissa's population even today remains without power. In Orissa as well as in Andhra Pradesh, where this programme was superimposed, power charges increased by fifteen percent per year, resulting in mass protest. Hence the Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme's real motto is 'the larger the debt of a country, the more assistance it will get from IMF/World Bank'. The advocates of neoliberal policies are now making a concerted move to
hoodwink humanity at large by speaking of 'globalization with a human face'. It is the same forces, and the Mexican government, which seek to destroy the Zapatistas community for having taken the lead for the First International Gathering of Humanity against neoliberalism in 1994.

While responding to the misleading promise of the finance Ministers of the G8 nations to cancel the debts the poorest countries owe to the IMF and the World Bank, George Monbiot, exposes the reality behind that promise. For, the conditions proposed by the G8 nations to fulfill their promise were: 1) the developing countries must tackle corruption, 2) boost private sector development, and 3) eliminate "impediments to private investment, both domestic and foreign". Monbiot observes that "corruption is often used by the G8 governments and the newspapers to mean regimes that will not do what they are told" ("Tarnished halos of the G8 Leaders". The Hindu 15 June 2005: 13). He adds that when the G8 governments say "good governance", and "eliminating impediments to private investment", they mean commercialization, privatization and liberalization of trade and capital flows. In short, Western money demands new opportunities in the indebted countries.

The disastrous impact of privatization of the state owned companies in Uganda in the late 1990s is another example of the IMF/World Bank trap. The IMF and the World Bank forced Uganda to impose "user fees" for basic healthcare and primary education. To the
consternation of the Ugandan government, school attendance and health care collapsed within a few years of the imposition of the new regulations. To ward off a possible revolution, the government of Uganda was compelled to reinstate free education in 1997, and free basic healthcare in 2001. The Ugandan experience, according to Monbiot, amounts to saying "we will give you a trickle of money if you give us the crown jewels" ("Tarnished halos of the G8 Leaders." The Hindu 15 June 2005: 13). This is the G8 way of saving the starving Africa.

In the case of Algeria, in April 1994 the Algerian Government came to an agreement with IMF to implement a stabilization programme including 40 percent currency devaluation, and a substantial rise in interest rates, in return for a standby credit of 1040 million US dollars. The IMF granted another credit to Algeria in 1995 to 'reschedule' the country's foreign debt. In 1995 the Algerian Government initiated structural reform programmes by liberalizing trade and payments, eliminating subsidies on energy products and food, and privatizing certain state owned companies. By 1997 Algeria experienced high-level unemployment and housing shortage. With the establishment of a stock exchange in 1998, Algeria's privatization programme was accelerated, in spite of mounting protests from public sector workers and trade unions. However, a redeeming factor is that even today 12.5 percent of the annual budget of Algeria is set apart for
education and teacher training. At present there are more than ten universities and several centers of them in Algeria.

In the new millennium, when the Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo tells the world that it is the scourge of hunger that causes pain in the belly of Africa, we are literally shocked. But, it is the ground reality of Africa. Those who make tall speeches about world peace, and the need to suppress insurgency seem to forget the fact that Europe has been primarily responsible for the present impasse in Nigeria and elsewhere in Africa. Europe has been virtually looting Africa for centuries. The drought situation in some African countries is a comparatively new development. As Walter Rodney observes, “All the countries named as ‘underdeveloped’ in the world are exploited by others; and the underdevelopment with which the world is now preoccupied, is a product of capitalist, imperialist and colonialist exploitation” (Rodney 22). Until they were taken over directly or indirectly by capitalist powers, the Asian and African societies were developing independently, and it was definitely on account of capitalist exploitation that these countries became pauper. Rodney is of the strong conviction that “a formerly colonized nation has no hope of developing until it breaks effectively with the vicious circle of exploitation which characterizes imperialism” (Rodney 35). A hungry people cannot be peaceful. For, as the Nigerian President quite painfully says, “A hungry person is an angry and dangerous person”. He further tells that in Africa “hunger and malnutrition continue to
kill more people than HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis combined” (“The Scourge of Africa” The Hindu 24 June 2005: 13). Obasanjo tells the world that Africa now reminds him of Oliver Twist. Like Oliver Twist, the Africans have been victimized, pauperized, and neglected by the European colonizers for centuries. The poverty of Africa today, is by and large, the creation of the West. Recently, strong doubt has been cast on the sincerity of Obasanjo, as there is a persistent demand in Nigeria for the trial of its President, for corruption.

Niger is perhaps the foremost among the African countries which are worst affected by starvation. According to Jeevan Vasagar, the starvation in Niger is “not the inevitable consequence of poverty, or simply the fault of locusts or drought. It is also the result of a belief that free market can solve the problems of one of the world’s poorest countries” (“Niger’s Children Doomed to Starve” The Hindu 9 Aug 2005: 11). The Niger government refuses to give free food to the starving, because the government is acting according to the dictates of the European Union and France, which are the chief donors to Niger. Curiously enough, the UN which under its World Food Programme supplies emergency food articles in other parts of Africa, refuses to distribute free food in Niger fearing that it would be interfering in the free market economy supported by the European Union and France.

In this context, I think, the works of organizations like CADTM (Committee for the Cancellation of the Third World Debt), founded in Belgium on 15 March 1990, are quite relevant. On the 16th year of its
formation too, the CADTM is of the view that it is high time the Official Development Assistance (ODA) be transformed into grants in reparation for the pillage the highly industrialized countries wrought over centuries in the countries of the Periphery. It is a pity that today the South African Nations are paying millions of dollars annually to service apartheid-caused debt to creditors who were the main supporters of apartheid. The international campaign for the cancellation of the debt of the Periphery countries, the central programme of the alter-globalization movement, is virtually the global manifestation of what Fanon as an individual political revolutionary earnestly desired, envisaged, and expressed in his exhortation for reparation by the colonizers, in 1961.

Unless a democratic set up in the countries of the South with citizen's control of public spending is assured, the complicity between the international monetary agencies, including the Multi-national Companies, and the rulers of the countries of the South will jeopardize the entire future of the Third and Fourth World citizens. If such kind of vigilance is not brought about, the countries of the South will remain victims of economic exploitation, and consequently, the inroads of the Multi-national capital will continue unchecked. In whichever countries of the South effective parliamentary democracy exist, the decision to borrow from the international monetary agencies must be taken only after a debate in the respective parliaments. Transparency about the terms of contracts signed by the creditors and
borrowers is imperative for avoiding hidden traps to hoodwink the people at large.

The only possible solution to this impasse, I think, is a humane and fair globalization, a globalization which is beneficial for the marginalized and the poor people of the world too. For, as Fidel Castro observes, "globalization is an irreversible process, and what we have to decide to choose is the kind of globalization which will be instrumental for the overall welfare of humanity as such, and not the welfare of a few at the expense of the majority of people of the world" (Castro 34). Castro is of the strong conviction that what we need is not the kind of neoliberal globalization that is dominating humanity at this point of time, but a fair and humane globalization. What the people of the Third and Fourth World countries require is international institutions having democratic legitimacy, instead of the IMF and the World Bank.

It was a quite remarkable gesture of the alter-globalists who gathered in Dakar, Senegal in December 2000 to demand both the restitution of what has been taken from Africa for centuries by sheer force, and reparations for all the crimes inflicted upon its people. Though it took almost four decades after the publication of Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, the gathering at Dakar in a way was the realization, though symbolic, of the dream of Fanon, the foremost revolutionary political prophet of the twentieth century. As the Dakar Manifesto upholds, "the only kind of development is the one, which
contributes to the full blossoming of the human being”, and “development is first of all qualitative and not purely quantitative phenomenon” (Manifesto for Making Another World Possible 65-66). In order to bring about such a development, the people of the Third World countries and the other peoples of the Periphery have to formulate development strategies which can be implemented by their own priorities. It will definitely ensure the participation of the people of the respective countries in an alternative globalization, a fair and humane globalization.

The first pioneering movement of a global scale in this direction, The World Social Forum, was organized in Porto Alegre, Brazil in Jan. 2001. The World Social Forum was a counterpoint to the World Economic Forum of Davos. The Porto Alegre gathering was a symbolic assertion of the supremacy of human, ecological and social rights over the demands of finance and investors. The second and the third World Social Forums were held in Alegre itself in 2002 and 2003 respectively. The thrust of the 2002 WSF was against the neoimperialistic atrocities unleashed in Iraq and Afghanistan by the U.S. allied forces in the name of ‘the war on terrorism’. The third WSF once again strongly demanded the full and unconditional cancellation of the Third World debt. The fourth WSF held in Mumbai in Jan. 2004 further confirmed the commitment made in the past three WSFs. The Mumbai WSF declared in emphatic terms that the ‘struggle against terrorism’ masterminded by the U.S., “not only acts as a pretext for
continuing the war and occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan, but it is also being used to threaten and attack the global community" (Manifesto for Making Another World Possible 112). The fifth WSF of Porto Alegre in Jan. 2005 further affirmed the belief that ‘another world is possible’. The participants called in question the very legitimacy of the G8, the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF, where a few decide for everybody. The WSF 2006, which was organized in Caracas, the Venezuelan capital, highlighted the need of the peoples of the underdeveloped and developing countries to unite further. President Hugo Chavez, who addressed the mammoth gathering of the WSF activists on 27 Jan. 2006, stressed this in his speech. For, he said, “We have to bring together all our causes. Unity, unity, unity! We can do it united”. Chavez, who spoke overwhelmingly of the policy of the Bush administration, described the U.S. government as “the most perverse, murderous, genocidal, immoral empire that this planet has known in hundred centuries” (as qtd. from the speech of Chavez at the World Social Forum on 27 Jan. 2006 in The Hindu 29 Jan. 2006: 12).

‘Make Poverty History’-campaign, spearheaded by the music star Bob Geldof has urged the G8 countries to contribute their best in combating the poverty of the African people. Like the CADTM, the ‘Make Poverty History’ campaign, too has demanded hundred percent debt cancellation for all African countries, and an end to ‘unjust trade rules’.
One of the most viable methods which can be adopted by the debtor countries is to take urgent measures for the retrocession of the funds deposited in creditor countries by the leaders of the periphery countries. J.K. Boyce and L. Ndikumana, two academics from the University of Massachusetts in the USA, observe that over the period from 1970 to 1996, the ruling elites of Africa had deposited 250 billion dollars in foreign banks (as quoted in Toussaint 30-31). In their study, they have noted the marked correlation between international loans and capital flight. The rulers of Nigeria, Rwanda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sierra Leone, Angola, Cameroon, Ivory Coast and Zambia were party to these kinds of deals. The sequestration of the Nigerian ruler, Abacha's accounts in nineteen London based banks is a victory for the people of Nigeria in their fight for the recovery of ill-gotten gains. Similarly, about 600 million dollars illegally deposited by the Philippines dictator, Ferdinand Marcos in Swiss banks from 1965 to 1986 have been frozen and returned to the Philippino authorities in 2003. During his long stint as President, Augusto Pinochet, the former dictator of Chile transferred a substantial amount of money from his country to foreign banks. Millions of dollars belonging to him and his family were belatedly discovered in a US bank. Surprisingly enough, the money was received as kickbacks from US defence contractors and companies.

The proposal for a tax on financial transactions first proposed by James Tobin, the 1972 Nobel prize winning economist (Popularly
known as the Tobin tax), has gained wide currency among other economists and human rights activists all over the world today. Tobin's proposal was the motivation for the now very popular movement ATTAC (Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for Aid to Citizens). According to UNCTAD (United Nations Conference for Trade and Development), 1000 billion dollars a day taxed at 1% would come to 720 billion dollars a year, and that out of this, 50% each can be set apart for social and ecological fund, and redistribution fund for the countries of the South. Tax on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) and Multi-national Companies' profits are the other suggestions of ATTAC to develop a global fund for guarantee of human rights, and the protection of the environment. Eric Toussaint is of the strong view that a global tax on aviation kerosene, which is causing considerable environmental pollution, must be levied, and the amount be utilized for guarantee of human rights and the protection of environment. Toussaint emphatically says that "rather than speaking of aid, henceforth it would be more appropriate to use the term reparation, the idea being to make reparation for all the damage caused by centuries of pillage and unfair trade" (Toussaint 104). It may be borne in mind that Fanon was the sole prophet and crusader who first propounded the very idea of reparation from the former oppressors to the oppressed of the world. All these issues highlight the contemporary relevance of Fanonian thoughts.
That the former colonizers have not still recovered from colonial hangover is being borne out by the remarks of Robert Cooper, a senior foreign policy adviser of the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, advocating a ‘new kind of imperialism’ which would allow the ‘well governed’ Western nations to impose order and stability in the world. It was in a pamphlet entitled ‘Reordering the World’ that Cooper has given expression to his neocolonialist agenda. Cooper is pained to note that “Empire and imperialism are words that have become terms of abuse in the post-modern world . . . and the need for colonization is as great as it ever was in the nineteenth century” (The Hindu 29 Mar. 2002: 16). Cooper proved himself to be the ‘right kind of adviser’ when Blair went ahead with his plan of backing the U.S. military action against Iraq.

The forty-six year old U.S. economic embargo against Cuba, the concerted move of the U.S. to destabilize Venezuela, Syria and Iran, the tirade and violence against the success of democracy in Palestine and Latin America as a whole, are by and large parts of further neocolonial offensives against the Third and Fourth World countries.

The discussion of Fanon’s prophetic revelations about neocolonialism would not be complete without analyzing how the neocolonialists make use of their military might, along with their money power, to strangle those Third and Fourth World countries of the world which do not dance to the tune of the Western neo-imperialists. The illegal invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the
eventual occupation of these two countries by America and its allies, and the persistent threat posed to the newly liberated Latin American countries by the United States of America are striking instances of the neo-imperialism of the new millennium.

It may be noted that Saddam Hussein would not have become the dictator of Iraq if the US had not aided and abetted him for nearly three decades since 1963. Saddam had participated in all the US-sponsored coups in Iraq between 1963 and 1968, which the Baathists carried out quite meticulously. Based on the information provided by the CIA, several members of the Iraqi communist party were killed during this period. It is a historic fact that Saddam was a close ally of the US from 1968 to the late 1980s. It was the US which prompted Saddam in 1980 to invade Iran. The US-UK alliance then supplied Saddam with satellite photographs, weapons and the other equipment of war, including the know-how to produce chemical weapons. Thus, the way for Saddam Hussein “to portray himself as Saladin, saviour of the Arabs, riding his white steed to wipe out the infidels” (Occidentalism 146) was actually paved by the US. It was only after Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait that he became an enemy of the US. Commenting on this kind of an association between Saddam and the US, Aijaz Ahmad makes a very apt observation. For, Ahmad says, “If Mary Shelley were to write the story of the love-hate relation between the US and Saddam, she would probably call it ‘Frankenstein and the Monster’” (Iraq, Afghanistan and the Imperialism of Our Time xx). It is
now proved beyond doubt that the reasons attributed by the US-UK alliance for the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, and its eventual occupation from 8 April 2003 onwards, have been blatantly false. Though the professed motive of the US and its allies was to 'liberate' Iraq from Saddam, the occupation forces have not left Iraq, even two years after getting Saddam under their custody. The present Iraqi Resistance Movement, which is gaining momentum as days go by, does not consist only of Saddam loyalists or Baathist party workers. The Iraqi National Foundation Congress (INFC), an umbrella group of parties and civil society organizations, is leading the political resistance. Several human-rights groups and women's organizations are supporting the Resistance Movement. Haifa Zangana, a novelist and a former prisoner of Saddam's regime testifies that “women are taken as hostages to persuade fugitive male relatives to surrender or confess to terrorist acts” (“Iraqi's right to rule themselves”. The Hindu 21 Nov. 2005: 13). The present reality in Iraq is that except for a few loyalists of the puppet Government installed by the US, all people alike in Iraq are against the US sponsored foreign occupation. As Aijaz Ahmad says, “with Saddam in captivity and the occupation getting more and more ferocious, the emperor is naked – cannot find his clothes, not even his fig leaves” (Ahmad xxii). The real objective of the US is now very transparent: 'you have to go where the oil is', as Dick Cheney, the US Vice-President is reported to have declared. This is further confirmed by the US Senator Ted Kennedy's reported
remark that the American government was indulging in ‘double-talk’ while US went to war against ‘terrorism’ in Iraq. That Saddam Hussein was building nuclear weapons, stockpiling weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), and that he was involved in 9/11, were turned out to be further lies propagated by the US warmongers to hoodwink the American people and the rest of the world.

Similarly America’s present move to tame Iran is also actually motivated by a desire to attack Iran with the specific objective of exploiting the oil and gas reserves of that country, and almost 20 percent of the oil reserves of the Caspian Sea basin which legitimately belongs to Iran. In the case of Afghanistan, one has to note that there were no Islamic terrorists there before the US created terrorists as a counterweight against the secular left, especially the USSR. Osama Bin Laden, the Saudi millionaire, was recruited as a CIA agent in the late 1970s to fight the Soviet supported secular regime of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan. Consequently, Bin Laden too was the product of an American sponsored terrorism in Afghanistan. In fact, Bin Laden built his numerous camps in Afghanistan with American money, and all other kinds of assistance provided by the US.

It is now very obvious that what the US has been seeking over the years is a ‘regime replacement’ as they call it, i.e. to replace by military might those regimes not to the liking of the US. Hence there is no virtual difference between colonial and neocolonial occupations.
For, colonization too was “the organization of the domination of a nation after military conquest”, as Fanon puts it (TAR 83). The present US occupation of Iraq is the result of such a policy. America’s justification of the invasion of Iraq and its subsequent occupation has been called in question even by the UN. It may be borne in mind that the sanctions imposed on Iraq by the UN Security Council for the past fifteen years was part of the machinations of the US to collectively punish the people of Iraq.

As Aijaz Ahmad unmistakably observes, “the cardinal sin of Saddam Hussein was neither the production of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), nor promotion of terrorism, but that . . . he made Iraq on 6 November 2000 the first oil producing country to shift from the dollar to the Euro as the currency for trade in oil and hence the primary currency for its foreign trade in general . . .” (Ahmad 145, Ahmad’s emphasis). Thus the war against Iraq was actually a currency war, a war between the dollar-sterling nexus and the Euro. The US very much feared that unless it checked the move of Saddam, the other OPEC countries would follow him suit, and thereby jeopardize America’s supremacy in the world, especially its dollar domination. A former British general, Michael Rose has described the US allied occupation of Iraq as “a blunder of enormous strategic significance” (“Impeach Blair on Iraq: British general”. The Hindu 11 Jan. 2006: 15). He further says that it was a war that was to unleash untold suffering on the Iraqi people.
The World Tribunal on Iraq (WTI), an antiwar grouping of non-governmental organizations, intellectuals, and writers founded in 2003 met in Islamabad in June 2005, and condemned the United States, Britain and their allies for the occupation of Iraq. It also demanded an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the coalition forces in Iraq. On the third anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Iraq by the US allied forces, hundreds of Britons took to the streets, braving freezing cold, demanding an end of occupation. It was a brave show of solidarity with war victims and ordinary innocent Iraqi people, organized by several antiwar forums including Campaign against Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and Stop the War Coalition (SWC). America’s hypocritical stand towards terrorism has been exposed further by other persons and organizations. Responding to the call of Pat Robertson, the American Evangelist, for the assassination of Hugo Chavez, the President of Venezuela, Jose Vincente Rangel, the Vice-President of Venezuela observes: “It is a huge hypocrisy to maintain this discourse against terrorism, and at the same time, in the heart of that country, there are entirely terrorist statements like those” (“Evangelist calls for Chavez assassination”. The Hindu 25 Aug. 2005: 16). Even while indulging in discourses on ‘terrorism’, but for some euphemistic change in the term (for, the new term for terrorism is ‘a global struggle against violent extremism’), America does not address itself to a greater kind of ‘terrorism’, that is, ‘hunger’, which is eating into the vitals of several Third and Fourth
World countries. For, as Hugo Chavez observes, "If the differences between the rich and poor, between developed and undeveloped, continued to grow, if everyday there is more destitution, more hunger, more death, well, that is another kind of terrorism" (Chavez 128).

If the Iraqi Resistance Movement goes on at the present pace, George Bush and the American-allied warmongers will be the victims of yet another syndrome, 'the Iraqi-syndrome', just as the 'Vietnam-syndrome' from the early 1970s till the victory of Vietnam under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, resulted in eroding the confidence of the Americans in the invincibility of its imperialism. My argument does not in any way negate the fact that a section of the Iraqi people were subjected to systematic repression, and many people were executed or jailed under Saddam Hussein's repressive regime. But, getting rid of a dictator who leads a repressive regime is primarily the responsibility of the people of the concerned country. Neither the US nor the UK has the moral or legal right to interfere in the affairs of the Iraqi citizens. When the justification for America's invasion of Iraq (Saddam Hussein's alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction) failed, America began to play the card of 'regime change for humanitarian grounds'. It may be noted that America's experience in Afghanistan had already exposed the pitfalls of 'humanitarian intervention'. It is now well known that the Bush administration's strategic aim was to invade Iraq after establishing a base for its operations in Afghanistan. Recent developments in the international political scenario further
expose America's dubious machinations. For, the next target of US 'intervention' is definitely Iran.

As nationalism was ultimately the US adversary in Vietnam, (perhaps more so than communism), in Iraq too nationalism is growing against American occupation and domination. The Iraqi people could see through very well the ulterior motive of the US when the card of 'divide and rule', the very same logic of colonial rule was played on them. Because, militants on both Shiite and Sunni sides have recently confided to Michael Ware, the *Time*’s Baghdad correspondent, that US forces remain a bigger enemy than their countrymen. They further said that they would rather fight to rid Iraq of US forces than take up arms against each other (“Can Iraq’s Militias be tamed?” *Time* 167 [2006]: 30-41). Iraqi Resistance leaders like Haifa Zangana justify the people's right to fight against the neoimperialists through armed resistance. According to her, the present armed resistance in Iraq is in accordance with a 1978 UN General Assembly resolution that reaffirmed “the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples for independence . . . from foreign occupation by all available means, particularly armed struggle” (“Iraqi’s right to rule themselves”. *The Hindu* 21 Nov. 2005: 13).

That America is vehemently trying to control all those who oppose its neoimperialist policies not only through military and economic subjugation, but through the control of the intellectuals of their lands, is borne out by the recent reports of ‘witch-hunting’ resorted to in
certain universities of America. Students in America are now given incentives for exposing the professors who speak against American imperialism and President Bush. Those students who are willing to oblige the administration are given 100 dollars each for tape-recording, and for obtaining a copy of all teaching materials. According to Dan Glaister, “by the third week of Jan. 2006, about 31 professors have been pinpointed whose classes are considered to be worthy of scrutiny” (“US Professors under scrutiny by Right-wingers”. The Hindu 20 Jan. 2006: 16). In the colonial times, teachers were most often looked upon as enemies by the colonizers. For, the colonizers feared that teachers were the ‘undesired’, but ‘competent’ persons powerful enough to instill the seeds of nationalism in the minds of the oppressed. The cerebral control imposed by the neoimperialists is a pointer to the fact that in the new millennium too, teachers pose a formidable threat to those who rampantly exploit the peoples of the Third and the Fourth World.

Reports of allegations of abuse, and indiscriminate shooting on 15 March 2006 in the village Al Bu Seifa in Iraq virtually baffled the conscience of the politically conscious people all over the world. Barring the discrepancy between the number of casualties provided by the US military and the Iraqi police, the incident has been confirmed. For, the US military said that four civilians, two women, a child, a man were killed while ‘looking for’ an Al Qaeda suspect; whereas, the Iraqi police reported that eleven civilians, including four women, and
four children were killed. Apart from these kinds of torture and abuses, reports of harrowing kinds of human rights violation are coming from the Guantanamo prison where the Iraqi captives are being jailed. Amnesty International in its report on human rights in May 2005 has said that Guantanamo is the “gulag of our times” ("What's going on at GITMO?") Time 165 [2005]: 38-39). The kinds of torture unleashed on the prisoners there justify the argument of Amnesty. In one instance, the captives are shackled in foetal position for twenty four hours without food or water, and left in their own excrement. In a report entitled “Inside the Wire”, co-written by former Army Sergeant Erik Saar who served at Gitmo, and Viveca Novak, Time correspondent, the authors cite an instance of a female interrogator smearing fake menstrual blood on a captive’s face. In another report, “Inside the Interrogation of Detainee 063”, Adam Zagorin and Michael Duffy write about the ‘counter-resistance strategies’ adopted by the Gitmo authorities on prisoners in violation of the letter and spirit of the Geneva Conventions which forbid ‘outrage on personal dignity’. Making a prisoner (Mohammed al-Quahtani) bark like a dog, and growl at pictures of ‘terrorists’, hanging pictures of scantly clad women around his neck, are some instances of the torture meted out to prisoners there. On another occasion, a female interrogator annoys al-Quahtani so much so that he tells his captors that he wants to commit suicide, and asks for a crayon to write his will. The victim was subjected to these kinds of tortures for
nearly one month. As Eric Freedman, a constitutional-law expert says, "If these techniques described in the interrogation log are not outrageous to personal dignity, then words have no meaning" ("Inside the Interrogation of Detainee 063." *Time* 625 [2005]:14-21). We have to bear in mind that all these onslaughts on human dignity have been carried on with the explicit connivance of President George Bush and his sycophants. In short, as Hugo Chavez observes, "the imperialist mass murdering fascist attitude of the President of the United States does not have limits". Chavez goes to the extent of saying that "Hitler could be a nursery baby next to George Bush" ("Chavez plans to arm one million people". *The Hindu* 6 Feb. 2006: 15).

In Afghanistan too the American design of divide and rule has failed miserably. Nearly five years after the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, America has almost dropped its long-cherished plan of the Trans-Afghan pipeline, though the US does not admit it publicly. Under the pretext of fighting the Taliban further, American neoimperialism has been and still is trampling upon the rights of the Afghan people for self-determination, and the women and children of Afghanistan are the worst affected sections in this regard. According to a prominent Afghan daily, "women and children who go to prison never return home with honour intact" (as quoted in "Has America lost its way in Afghanistan." *The Hindu* 17 Mar 2006: 10). That America is losing its 'war against terrorism' in Afghanistan is endorsed by the observation of the Head of the Defence Intelligence Agency of America,
Lt. General Michael D Maples. For, he says, "The Taliban dominated insurgency remains capable and resistant" in today's Afghanistan ("Has America lost its way in Afghanistan." *The Hindu* 17 Mar. 2006: 10). The preceding observations drive home the fact that far from being a beaten force, the Taliban appears to be determined for a powerful comeback in Afghanistan. Surprisingly enough, the Taliban which was deadly opposed to drug trafficking and condemned opium as 'un-Islamic' before the US invasion of Afghanistan, now encourages poppy cultivation in its strongholds apparently to find out the resources for its operations. By now, the American allied forces in Afghanistan and Iraq have realized that they are not likely to win, but 'exigency of circumstances', especially, the hubris of George Bush and Tony Blair keep them in these countries.

The hollowness of the much-discussed 'global campaign for democracy', principally undertaken by George Bush and Tony Blair, has been exposed to the world when these leaders refused to recognize the Hamas victory in Palestine. As Will Hutton observes, "The worst that the international community could commit is to refuse all dealings with Hamas" ("Now the real challenge for Hamas." *The Hindu* 30 Jan. 2006: 11). Those who have genuine concern for democracy have to support and do everything possible to fulfill the democratic aspirations of the Palestinian people and their elected representatives. The Bush administration now refuses to recognize Hamas victory alleging that Hamas is a terrorist organization. But, it is a widely
accepted fact that the Palestinian people exercised their right to self-determination in a free and fair election conducted under the supervision of international observers. If Hamas had resorted to terrorism before the Palestinian elections, it was to ‘right a great wrong’, that is, their fight was against the decades old oppression meted out to them by Israel with the obvious support of the US. In spite of the declaration of the political bureau of Hamas that they are ready for a just peace, the Bush administration refuses to yield. All the same, Hamas has told the international community in unequivocal terms that they cannot be intimidated, as the statement of the head of their political bureau, Khalid Mish'al reveals. For, he says, “our people in Palestine should not need to wait for any aid from countries that attach humiliating conditions to every dollar or euro they pay despite their historical and moral responsibility for our plight” (“Hamas ready for a just peace.” The Hindu 1 Feb. 2006: 11).

The eighteen-page letter which the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad sent to his American counterpart on 8 May, 2006, apart from its purpose of ‘resolving’ the ‘issues’ at stake, is a strong condemnation of the US hegemony on world affairs. That the letter has frustrated and provoked President Bush beyond description is evidenced in the rejection of it by Condoleezza Rice, the US Secretary of State. The US refusal to find out diplomatic solutions to the issues between the two countries sends a very bad signal to the international community at large. What the US actually requires in Iran is a 'regime
change', a regime which will act according to the dictates of the US and British warlords. America’s allegation that Iran is enriching uranium to make weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) has specific parallelism to the ‘Washington fiction’ in 2003 that Iraq was in possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

There have been widespread protests in the US and in Britain against the US-UK move to strangle the people of Iran in the name of the much-debated uranium enrichment programme of Iran. Tonny Benn, who was a Cabinet Minister under Harold Wilson and James Callaghan, observes that George Bush’s threat against Iran under the pretext of upholding the principles of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is to hoodwink humanity at large, and to regain the political credibility of Bush, which has been lost in Iraq. According to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), non-nuclear nations are not to acquire nuclear weapons if nuclear powers undertook not to extend their nuclear arsenals and to seek to secure their abolition. The irony of the situation is that since the signing of the NPT, as Tonny Benn observes, “The Americas have launched a programme that would allow them to use nuclear weapons in space, nuclear bunker-busting bombs are being developed, and depleted uranium has been used in Iraq – all which are clear breaches of the NPT” (“Iran: George Bush is the Real Threat.” The Hindu 1 Sept. 2005: 11).

By opposing Iran’s legitimate right to process uranium for nuclear fuel, and thereby to diversify its energy resources, America’s
real aim is to prevent Iran's comprehensive development. Iran has been prompted to enrich uranium anticipating a shortage of oil by 2024. This highlights the legitimate wish of the country to develop alternative sources of energy, including nuclear fuel. In this context, the speech of the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in the UN General Assembly in September 2005 is quite thought-provoking. For, he is reported to have said that everyday, the United States of America and its allies are threatening other nations with nuclear weapons, and, curiously enough, they are never inspected. While condemning the US policy in this regard, the Iranian President said that the US is practising 'nuclear apartheid'. The Iranian President's stance in this issue is all the more vindicated as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has revealed that there is no conclusive evidence that Teheran had diverted materials towards making atomic weapons.

Hope has been stirred in the minds of the Iranian people, and all those politically conscious people of the rest of the world, thanks to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization's (SCO) support to Iran. As the SCO comprises China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, it will not be that easy as far as the US is concerned to take a unilateral decision against Iran. However, the peace loving people of the world cannot sit complacently when they have in mind the report of Seymour Hersh, an influential investigative journalist with The New Yorker magazine, which tells the world that Washington
has stepped up plans for possible attacks on Iranian facilities to curb its 'atomic work'.

The US and the UK have no moral and legal right to order the other nations of the world to disarm, since these two countries are in possession of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons competent enough to wipe out humanity at large from this planet within hours. Paradoxically enough, even while clamouring for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons, the United States has been developing deadlier weapons as evidenced in its operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. What is more, as Fidel Castro observes, "The United States of America is the chief promoter and patron of massive violations of human rights in Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world" (Castro 103). The US has been using weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) for destroying the infrastructure and economies of different countries of the world in the name of 'war on terror'.

What political morality demands today is the trial of George Bush and Tony Blair for war crimes in the International Court of Justice. The complicity of Kofi Annan, the current custodian of the UN Charter, in the invasion of Iraq by the US allied forces is obvious when we consider the timing of the order issued by Annan to stop the Oil-for-Food programme meant for the Iraqi civilians. As Aijaz Ahmad emphatically says, "A plausible legal case can be made against Annan for dereliction of duty as defender of the UN Charter, and for aiding
and abetting war criminals of the Bush and Blair administrations” (Ahmad 159).

The invasion and subsequent occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq in the new millennium belies Fanon’s remarks on the power of the imperial countries after the Second World War. For, in The Wretched of the Earth, Fanon evinced the hope that the chance of prolonged occupation of a country by external forces was not likely in the latter half of the twentieth century. Fanon observes: “The truth is that there is no colonial power today which is capable of adopting the only form of contest which has a chance of succeeding, namely, prolonged establishment of large forces of occupation” (WE 58). But, the American occupation of Vietnam till 1975, and Iraq in the new millennium are specific examples to prove that the neocolonial beast is more ferocious than the colonial beast. It is high time that people like the authors of Occidentalism did a rethinking as to why the ‘enemies’ of the West have been painting a “dehumanizing picture of the West” (Occidentalism 5). George Bush and his allies had sown the wind; now they have to reap the whirlwind. If anybody fondles the hope that the neocolonialist will someday change into a lamb, it is a fond hope indeed. The frightening nature of the neoimperialist, and neoliberal offensives already analyzed proves that “Fanon does not have an equal in analyzing the last stages of African colonialism and the advent of neocolonialism”, as Walter Rodney observes (Rodney 310).
Fanon’s Influence on the Black Power and Black Arts Movements

The influence of Fanon on the Black Power and Black Arts Movements is perhaps the most dramatic instance of the Fanonian concepts of decolonization outside Algeria. The Black writers of America, especially since 1960, were fundamentally opposed to the Western concept of ‘art for art’s sake’. They believe that art must be functional; art has to serve an end beyond itself. Ron Milner, one of the leading playwrights of the New Black Theatre is of the view that “Art for art’s sake: is incest”. He further felt that “Black people desperately needed a healthy natural art form: art coming from an intercourse with life” (as qtd. in “Notes on Ritual in the New Black Theatre.” by Shelby Steele in Errol Hill ed. The Theatre of Black Americans 30-44).

The Black writers of America and the African countries have been tremendously influenced by Fanon’s diagnosis of colonialism and its disastrous consequences. The Black Art and Black Nationhood concepts of the American Black writers took a decisive turn once they analyzed Fanon’s justification of violence for the emancipation of the wretched of the earth. Though Black writers like Alian Locke and Ron Karenga had tried their best to formulate a Black aesthetics, it was the Black writers of the 1960s who made it a reality. Alian Locke believed that “the real future of the Negro drama lies with the development of the folk play” ("The Negro and the American Theatre" in The Black Aesthetic 268). Ron Karenga, the Black Nationalist, also
believed that the Black people’s aspiration for self-determination could be achieved only through revolutionary methods. For, Karenga observes, “Black Art must expose the enemy, praise the people, and support the revolution” (“Black Cultural Nationalism” in Addison Gayle Jr. ed. The Black Aesthetic 32). But it was Fanon’s concept of authentic decolonization which could lend a militant nature to the desire of self-determination and nationhood of the Black Americans. Until they read Fanon, the Black people of America were at a loss as to what method would be suitable for their liberation from the oppressive White regime – whether the non-violent ideals of Martin Luther King, or the revolutionary thoughts of Malcolm X. But once they read Fanon, there took place a radical change in their outlook on life itself, for, as Larry Neal says, they were “looking at a picture of someone who looked like them, someone who has a similar experience” (“The Social Background of the Black Arts Movement” in Black Scholar Jan-Feb, 1987). The term ‘Black’ acquired a new dimension after they read Fanon. Fanon’s impact on the black people was so profound that any intellectual who had not read Fanon, especially his Black Skin, White Masks and The Wretched of the Earth, was looked upon as one who has not read two essential books. Fanon told them that imperialism, colonialism and racism have been the root cause of their depredation. With the assassination of Malcolm X, an embodiment of Black Nationalism in 1965, the Black people of America further realized that counter-violence was justifiable for the
true emancipation of them from the heinous oppression meted out to them by the White administration. This new awareness created by Fanon resulted in the development of 'Black Consciousness' as opposed to the hitherto upheld 'Negro Sensibility'. It was out of this Black Consciousness that LeRoi Jones (Imamu Amiri Baraka), Ed Bullins, Ron Milner and a host of other Black writers evolved a Black Aesthetics. These writers believed that the White Aesthetics was opposed to the very concept of self-determination of the Blacks. As Larry Neal remarks, “The Black Arts Movement is radically opposed to any concept of the art that alienates the artist from his/her community”. Larry Neal further says, “Black Art is the aesthetic and spiritual sister of the Black Power concept” (“The Black Arts Movement” in Annemarie Bean ed. A Sourcebook of African-American Performance 55-67). Larry Neal believed that the Black Arts and the Black Power concepts both related broadly to the Afro-American desire for self-determination. The Black people felt the necessity of defining the world in their own terms. Besides, Larry Neal adds that the Black Art movement advocated a cultural revolution in arts and ideas because, the Black artists strongly believed in Fanon’s warning that destroying the culture was equivalent to destroying the people.

Though the concept of 'Black Arts' is not new, as Larry Neal observes, it was first used in a positive sense by LeRoi Jones. For, about Black Arts LeRoi Jones wrote: “We are black magicians/Black arts we make/in black labs of the heart” (as qtd. in “The Black Arts
LeRoi Jones' essay "The Revolutionary Theatre" is considered as the manifesto of the radical Black Theatre of America. LeRoi Jones was very particular that the Revolutionary Theatre should force change. As Larry Neal remarks, "the Black Arts Theatre, the theatre of LeRoi Jones [Amiri Baraka], is a radical alternative to the sterility of the American theatre" ("The Black Arts Movement." A Sourcebook of African-American Performance 55-67).

In 1967, Ed Bullins, another prominent leader of the Black Arts Movement published an essay entitled "The So Called Avant Garde Drama" in which he stressed the need of a Black Theatre that rejects the pervasive cultural decay of the American White theatre. In an interview with Marvin X in 1969, Bullins further elaborated his concept of the Revolutionary Theatre. For, he observes:

We do not want to have a higher form of white art in Black face. We are working towards something entirely different and new that encompasses the soul and the spirit of the Black people, and that represents the whole experience of our being here in this oppressive land. . . . Our aim is not only to become artists individually and collectively, but to create a uniform positive art. ("Interview with Ed Bullins" in New Plays from the Black Theatre xii)
Ron Milner also highlights the need of a theatre committed to the underprivileged and marginalized sections of the society. In his essay “Black Theatre – Go Home”, he admonishes the Black dramatists to draw their materials from the people to whom they in turn, communicate intensified and organized perceptions (The Black Aesthetic 288-94).

LeRoi Jones is considered as the father of the Black Arts Cultural Movement. He was the ‘angry young man’ of America of the 1950s and 60s, perhaps a counterpart of John Osborne of England in the 1940s and 50s, in a very limited sense. LeRoi Jones aimed at the radical and complete rejection of the commercial theatre. He strongly believed that Black Theatre could be legitimized by the Black community only. In the spring of 1965 he founded The Black Arts Repertory Theatre School in Harlem. It was the first step towards the establishment of a theatre which highlights the truth of the oppressed Blacks as the only meaningful reality. But The Black Arts Repertory Theatre had a very short span of life, for, seven months after its establishment it collapsed allegedly because of its ‘terrorist’ nature. All the same the Black arts movement was a pungent critique of the White American society and its culture. The American Black artists of the 1960s “denounced the seeming complacency of their immediate elders”, as Thomas DeFrance observes. DeFrance further says that the motto of the 1963 March to Washington led by Martin Luther King, “We Shall Overcome”, was replaced by “Up Against the Wall, Motherfucker”, a
slogan popularized by LeRoi Jones ("To Make Black Bodies Strange" in *A Source Book of African-American Performance* 83-93). After the closure of the BART, Jones started the Spirit House, the spiritual centre of the Black Arts movement in America. The theatre of the people of the Spirit House was known as the Spirit House Movers.

It was LeRoi Jones’ *Dutchman* that radically reordered the internal structure of the Black Theatre, for, as Larry Neal remarks, the *Dutchman* “is implicitly but very clearly addressed to the radical sector of the Black socio-political consciousness” (“Into Nationalism, Out of Parochialism” in Errol Hill Ed. *The Theatre of Black Americans* 293-300).

The subway in summer – what LeRoi Jones describes as ‘the flying underbelly of the city’ – where the entire actions of *Dutchman* take place, according to Ruby Cohn, “is his [Jones’] most telling dramatic inferno” (*New American Dramatists* 98). Clay Williams of *Dutchman* is an educated Negro man with ‘black skin, and white mask’. But, the mask which he wears in public in his attempt to assert his ‘individuality’ does not in reality help him to overcome the assault of the White world as represented by Lula, the “white demon-woman” as DeFrance calls her ("To Make Black Bodies Strange"). When Clay eventually succeeds in discarding his mask, it is too late. As Ruby Cohn rightly puts, “the young Black is clay in the hands of Lulu-Lilith white woman, *la belle dame sans merci*” (Cohn 99). Larry Neal observes that Clay is doomed when he allows himself to participate in
Lula’s ‘fantasy’ in the first place. He further says, “It is the fantasy to which Frantz Fanon alludes in The Wretched of the Earth and Black Skin, White Masks: the native’s belief that he can acquire the oppressor’s power by acquiring his symbols, the one of which is the white woman” (“The Black Arts Movement.” A Sourcebook of African-American Performance 55-67). However, Clay’s vehement indictment of the White society resounds in the minds of the audience as the curtain of Dutchman falls. Clayton Riley’s comment on the language of Dutchman is worth quoting. For, he says, “It stabbed America in every private place and part” with the urgent force of total commitment (“On Black Theatre” in The Black Aesthetic 313-330).

The eventual killing of the White Voice of Slave Ship (a play LeRoi Jones wrote in 1967), is the symbolic expression of the Black community of America to put an end to White supremacy, which has been the prime cause of the sufferings of the Blacks. The play Slave Ship conveys the message that the Black people can create their own destiny. Slave Ship is, in a sense, the clarion call for revolution, an important agenda of Black Nationalism.

Most often, the White women in the plays of Black writers like LeRoi Jones and Ed Bullins are symbols of evil who taunt Black males with their perverse sexuality. Shelby Steele is of the view that the White woman “often symbolizes the relationship of America to the Black man” (“Notes on Ritual.” The Theatre of Black Americans 30-44). In Bullins’ one-act play The Gentleman Caller, Madame (Mrs.
Mann), the central character is the embodiment of evil. She makes very obvious attempts to be seduced by the black gentleman caller. But, by refusing to yield to her seduction, the gentleman caller asserts his Black identity. The very posture and manners of the man are indicative of his determination to defy the superiority of the Whites. Surprisingly enough, in spite of the persistent provocation of Mrs. Mann, the gentleman caller keeps silent throughout his brief sojourn at the comfortable and fashionable living room of Mrs. Mann. The gentleman caller proves himself to be quite unlike Clay Williams of *Dutchman*. Mrs. Mann's shock and exasperation is quite obvious. For, she exclaims, "times have changed, haven't they?" ("The Gentleman Caller" in Ed Bullins Ed. *Contemporary Black Drama* 377).

Mamie, the Black maid-servant of Mrs. Mann, too asserts her individuality by shooting Mrs. Mann on her head with a pump-action shotgun. Mamie had already contemplated leaving Mrs. Mann's service in a heroic way. Her sense of revenge for having been enslaved for years is so intense that she fires shells into the twitching corpse of Mrs. Mann. According to Shelby Steele, "The murder of Mrs. Mann by the black maid in the Bullins play affirms the maid's Blackness and consummates her transition from a foot-shuffling house Nigger to a proud Black woman" ("Notes on Ritual"). The murder of Mrs. Mann by her maid is a striking example of the counter-violence of the oppressed Negro; in other words, violence boomerangs here, though belatedly. In Shelby Steele' opinion, "The use of murder in this way
corresponds closely to Frantz Fanon’s view which sees the violence of the oppressed as redemptive and self-affirming” (“Notes on Ritual.” The Theatre of Black Americans 30-44).

The kind of personal transformation which is seen in the character of Mamie is yet another theme of the modern American Black Theatre. In the beginning of The Gentleman Caller, Mamie is the “hideous symbol of Black humiliation”, as Shelby Steele comments (“Notes on Ritual.” The Theatre of Black Americans 30-44). Mrs. Mann has been treating Maime as a property. For, she says, Maime is “one of the truly worthwhile possessions” that her father left with the family (“The Gentleman Caller” in Contemporary Black Drama 372). Mrs. Mann further remarks that Maime has no right to think for herself. But, towards the end of the play, Maime gives expression to her long-cherished desire for self-determination at any cost. Because, the maid asserts, “It’s time for Black people to come together in unity . . . Yes, we are coming father. We are forming the foretold Black nation that will survive, conquer, and rule under your divine guidance” (“The Gentleman Caller” Contemporary Black Drama 380). Maime ultimately realizes that resistance and self-assertion are the only means to recover her lost identity.

Besides the influence of Fanon on the writers and movements already discussed, in the Middle East also, Fanon has been an icon of the liberation struggles of the oppressed people. In fact he is ranked with Mao and Che Guevera, as one of the revolutionary leaders
acclaimed by the militant elements in the Palestine Resistance Movement, especially by the rank and file of the Fatah Party. In a paper presented by H. I. Hussaini, a Fatah Party activist at the Arab-American University Graduate convention that was held in the winter of 1969, he observes, “by adopting armed struggle and violence, al Fatah has been able to create the spirit that Fanon spoke of” (qtd. from “The Palestinian Revolution: ‘al Fatah: Origins and Strategies” in Gendzier 267).

The issues examined hitherto have driven home that what Fanon had done through his works was a microscopic dissection and analysis of colonialism and neocolonialism with the precision of a surgeon. Fanon has succeeded not only in diagnosing colonialism in all its seriousness, but has prescribed unmistakable remedy through his concepts of authentic decolonization. And, as for his prophetic predictions on neocolonialism, he has no counterpart till date. However, Fanon’s ultimate goal of fostering the full development of humanity, holding out human dignity, freedom, love, care, and justice to all the underprivileged and marginalized people of the world has not yet been materialized. Unless the politically conscious people of the world at large do something concrete to check the onslaught of neo-imperialism on the underdeveloped and marginalized people of the world, neocolonialists will have their heyday.