

boundaries as distinct social formations.

Under colonialism, proletarianization, for the most part, preceded the emergence of a local bourgeoisie. The introduction of commercialized agriculture and plantation economy was imposed by colonial powers through the penetration of capital; distorting the traditional relations of production, ~~with a conscious effort not to allow for the generalization of the capitalist~~ relations within the colony (classic examples are Malaysia, the Caribbeans and East Africa, where the British imported Chinese and Indian labor to be proletarianized in the rubber and other plantations, keeping intact the local social structure). Colonial powers are not interested in developing a competitor local industrial bourgeoisie, but rather in maintaining the colony as a market for their own manufactured goods, and as a pool of cheap resources.

Under neo-colonialism, distinguished by the drive for a capital market, local industrialization and the emergence of a dependent bourgeoisie become indispensable for the extended reproduction of capitalism on a world scale. Proletarianization occurs directly through foreign capital penetration, or through a local bourgeoisie, whose very existence is dependent on the international bourgeoisie. In this case, capitalist relations predominate, subject to the logic of capitalist accumulation on a world scale. It does not culminate, however, in the generalization of capitalist relations to the entire mass of immediate producers.⁸ On the contrary, an underdeveloped "traditional" sector is deliberately maintained and distorted to provide for the development of the "modern" sectors. The largest proportion of immediate producers is linked indirectly to the capitalist accumulation process, and hence, impoverished without proletarianization: they are