

A QUESTION OF DEPENDENCY*

Ronald H. Chilcote

University of California, Riverside

The dependency perspective has become a major thrust, both in bourgeois and Marxist conceptions of development and underdevelopment in Latin America, but the distinctions between the two interpretations have been blurred. No unified theory of dependency yet exists, but a variety of theoretical tendencies tends to cluster in the literature on dependency. The discussion that follows differentiates between the bourgeois and Marxist interpretations by focusing on some fundamental weaknesses of dependency theory that emanate among those who utilize a Marxist analysis. In particular, there is concern that dependency theories ignore social classes and class conflict or that these theories tend to present mechanical schemes in which external rather than internal aspects are determinant. Further, it is argued that dependency theories are nationalist in ideology and advocate autonomous capitalist development rather than offering solutions or strategies for the transition from capitalism to socialism.

MODELS OF DEVELOPMENT AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT: DEPENDENCY AND DIFFUSION

In seeking an understanding of development and underdevelopment, a previous work (Chilcote and Edelstein 1974, pp. 1–87) refers to models of diffusion and dependency. A model is a heuristic device that orders disparate information and demonstrates relationships. A model is a simplified representation of the real world, a mental construction. A model is not a theory, although often it is distorted to signify theoretical advancement. Theory, in contrast, involves viewing and thinking. Theory generates insight. Theory is a coherent body of generalizations and principles associated with the practice of inquiry.

The distinctions between the diffusion and dependency models make clear the prevailing assumptions that underlie current explanations of development and underdevelopment. Advocates of the diffusion model look to government aid programs, financial institutions, and private corporations and assume that progress will evolve through the diffusion or trickling down of capital, technology, and organizational methods from modern capitalist areas to backward areas of the Third World. This model sees capitalist development as a possibility for all nations. In Latin America, modern cities have flourished in contact with the developed capitalist world while the rural countryside has

*I would like to thank Joel Edelstein, Timothy Harding, and Jaime Regalado for their comments and criticisms of an early draft of this paper.

remained mired in the backward agriculture of large, unproductive feudal estates. Just as feudal England overcame its backwardness with the rise of commerce and capitalism, diffusionists claim, so too will the underdeveloped rural areas and nations overcome their backwardness. In contrast, those favoring the dependency model assume that the now developed countries were never underdeveloped and that contemporary underdevelopment was created by the diffusion of capitalism. This view understands underdevelopment in Latin America as a consequence of foreign penetration; underdeveloped countries can develop only if both their internal structures and their relations with other nations undergo a fundamental change. Implied in most but not all interpretations is a need to change from capitalism to socialism.

This use of models in reference to diffusion and dependency compels the student of Latin American affairs to acknowledge a dichotomy of assumptions and explanations in the search to understand the area. The student must choose between divergent views; thus, modelling serves a pedagogical objective of stimulating critical thinking. No longer is it necessary to conform to the traditional ethnocentric North American interpretations of Latin America. An alternative interpretation also is available.

This characterization of these two models of development and underdevelopment somewhat parallels Thomas Kuhn's (1970) broader conception of paradigm. A paradigm is a scientific community's perspective of the world, its set of beliefs and commitments. A paradigm guides the scientific community's selection of problems, evaluation of data, and advocacy of theory. Elsewhere (Chilcote forthcoming) I elaborate on the orthodox social science paradigm whose origins are drawn from liberal thought as well as traditions established in the nineteenth century by the classical British empiricism of David Hume and the positivist principles of Auguste Comte. According to these traditions, scientific principles are based on sensory experience independent of time, place, and circumstance. Generalizations about the external world are meaningful only if they are based on the raw material of experience. Positivism influenced many thinkers to emphasize abstract political analysis resulting in a separation of content from political thought. Rigorous testing and quantitative procedures became commonplace in an effort to systematize the study of social behavior into science. The diffusion model, with its finite criteria of per capita income, illiteracy, inequality, political instability, and other measures of underdevelopment, thus has been employed in the orthodox paradigm of contemporary social science.

Historicism challenged positivist thought by arguing that data based on sensations are not acquired in unbiased situations. The mind is active, not passive, and selects and shapes experience according to prior awareness. A social situation can only be understood in terms of history. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were historicists who took special interest in the distinct roles of different classes in the process of production and in their relations to the state: exploitation of class by class and ensuing class struggle occur in the history of all societies after the introduction of private property. The nineteenth-century Marxists contributed to the effort, now prevalent in the socialist world but also con-

spicuous in the capitalist world, to seek a radical paradigm as an alternative to the liberalism and positivism that have ensured the hegemony, at least in the Western world, of the orthodox paradigm in social science. Kuhn argued that a "scientific revolution" occurs when one paradigm takes the place of another. While this has not occurred in the United States or in Latin America, the holistic perspective and the revolutionary, materialist, and humanist characteristics of the radical Marxist paradigm carry weight. Although it emphasizes external aspects and often fails to incorporate a Marxist class analysis, the dependency model, with its critique of ahistorical and evolutionary diffusionism, would seem compatible with the radical Marxist paradigm.

While many Latin Americanists today reject traditional and orthodox views of Latin America and identify themselves with dependency, one might question if a dependency view has embedded itself in Latin American studies. Dependency is usually understood as a condition arising not from class relations but from a relationship between dominant and dependent countries. Theotonio dos Santos describes dependency as "a situation in which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected" (1970, p. 231). Most Latin Americanists probably accept this description of dependency, but their perspectives of development and underdevelopment reflect diverse understandings. Some writers have set forth their understanding of development and underdevelopment as theoretical formulations; these attempts have been identified elsewhere (Chilcote 1974). Below I relate them to the diffusion and dependency models.

Traditional Diffusion

Since the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 and the advances of American manifest destiny, the United States has intervened hundreds of times militarily in the internal affairs of Latin America. Such overt interventions were accompanied by the establishment of a number of financial institutions, including the Export-Import Bank in 1934 and the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in 1944. In 1961 the Alliance for Progress was designed as an aid program to promote gradual development and, in the words of then U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, to defend "Western Civilization." Purportedly a revolutionary program, the Alliance was in fact a façade for old strategies to serve U.S. capitalism. Not only must the United States as benefactor maintain civilization in the Western world, but North American penetration into backward economies was essential to the elimination of underdevelopment. Since the nineteenth century much of the literature on Latin America has reflected this "civilizing" theme.

Desarrollista Diffusion

The writings of Argentine economist Raúl Prebisch and others associated with the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America (ECLA) assumed a nationalist and sometimes an antiimperialist position in pushing for desarrollista

or developmental solutions premised on import-substitution industrialization and the establishment of an infrastructure of roads, power, and other basics essential to heavy industrialization. Their stance reflected the national bourgeois hope of attaining economic independence and national development within the capitalist world, a hope that faded with the rapid penetration of multinational corporations into production for the local Latin American market. The ECLA writers divided the world into an industrial center and a primary producing periphery and concluded that most of the increment in world income tends to be appropriated by the center. This formulation actually was utilized by dependentistas who later were to react to desarrollista schemes that resulted not in national development but in serious economic problems and an undermining of the autonomy that the national bourgeoisie sought. For this reason the desarrollista ideas sometimes are assumed to be dependentista ideas, when in fact some bourgeois and Marxist dependentistas who emerged in the sixties were reacting to inadequate bourgeois theory of nationalist development.

They also were reacting to pro-Soviet Communist parties that traditionally assumed Latin America's feudalism had to be overcome by a bourgeois revolution, led by a national bourgeoisie, and supported by the working class; this in turn would be followed by a socialist revolution. Marxist dependentistas attacked such a view as intransigent, for it undermined working-class interests through reformist policies and bourgeois alliances as well as postponement of socialism.

Dependency as Development of Underdevelopment

Dependentistas reached for a new analysis of the relationship between the center and the periphery. They affirmed that the ECLA thesis failed to examine the specific needs of capitalism at the center, that it mistakenly attributed backwardness in Latin America to the traditional and feudal oligarchies, and that it wrongly assumed that development could be promoted by a progressive national bourgeoisie. André Gunder Frank (1967), for example, emphasized commercial monopoly rather than feudalism and precapitalist forms as the economic means whereby national and regional metropolises exploit and appropriate economic surplus from the satellites. Capitalism on a world scale, he argued, produces a developing metropolis or center and an underdeveloped satellite or periphery; this relationship is found between nations and within nations between, for instance, a developing capital city (the metropolis) and the surrounding cities and regions (satellites). Frank described his thesis as capitalist development of underdevelopment. Frank has influenced a host of other writers to analyze Latin America in these terms, and Walter Rodney (1972) extended the idea of capitalist underdevelopment to Africa. Among the criticisms of the Frank thesis is the view that his conception of underdevelopment is not set forth in terms of a class analysis; that the emphasis on external considerations diverts attention from internal class antagonisms of Latin American society; that dependency is seen as static and persistent, not changing; that the term dependency lacks enough specific content to be operational.

The New Dependency and Imperialism

Theotonio dos Santos reminds us (1976) that theories of dependency emanated from nationalist movements that a decade or two ago were demanding national liberation. These movements tended to coalesce the radical bourgeoisie with revolutionary labor. Dos Santos (1970) identifies types of dependency through periods of history: colonial dependency, financial-industrial dependency, and "new" dependency. Financial-industrial dependency, like imperialism, dates from the end of the nineteenth century with the consolidation of capital in hegemonic centers and investment of capital in the peripheral colonies for raw materials and agricultural products that in turn were consumed by the centers. The new technological and industrial dependency evolved with investments by multinational corporations after the Second World War. Dos Santos' dependency types emphasize a view of imperialism and the impact of capitalism upon the internal class structure of the Latin American countries.

This effort to tie external to internal aspects of dependency represented an attempt to extend traditional Leninist and other theories of imperialism to an analysis of underdevelopment in Latin America. Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1972) has explicitly tied theories of dependency to imperialism. He notes that the term dependency is rooted in the writings of Lenin and Trotsky, and he attempts to relate classical formulations to the dependency literature of the past decade. Cardoso concludes, however, that modern forms of capital accumulation and imperialism differ from Lenin's earlier conceptions. Capital accumulation, for example, is more the consequence of corporate rather than financial control, he argues. While contemporary international capitalist expansion and control of dependent economies reflects a new pattern, the economic relationship among nations remains imperialist.

Cardoso seems to be emphasizing a view that imperialism is necessary for the advancement of capitalist economies. The view usually emanating from the periphery stresses the detrimental consequences of capitalist trade and investment in the poorer areas of the world. Both these dependency views incorporate a theory of imperialism. Thus, some perspectives of imperialism relate it explicitly to dependency, while others refute certain formulations of dependency in favor of an interpretation solely based on Lenin's theory of imperialism (Fernández and Ocampo, 1974, for example). While most theories of imperialism assume an inequality between nations, implying the exploitation of dominant nations over dependent nations, some distinctions between non-Marxist and Marxist interpretations can be made. Non-Marxist or bourgeois theory tends to associate imperialism with expansionism, thereby obscuring the subtle mechanisms through which imperialism has been internalized: such theory addresses itself to political and military explanations. In contrast, Marxist theory deals with economic explanations and sees capitalism as a worldwide network of commercial, financial, and other relations that integrates, not isolates, all nations.

Dependent Development

Cardoso argues (1973, p. 11) that monopoly capitalism and development are not contradictory terms; dependent capitalist development has become a new form of monopolistic expansion in the Third World. At the same time, he believes that the amount of net foreign capital in dependent economies is decreasing, for new foreign capital is not needed where there are local savings and reinvestment of profits in local markets. Cardoso suggests that much dependentista analysis is flawed: imperialism will not necessarily unite but instead will fragment the interests and reactions of dependent nations; and capitalist development of underdevelopment and the lack of dynamism in dependent economies caused by imperialism are distorted assumptions because development and dependency are compatible in some situations.

We have referred to two models, diffusion and dependency, as a pedagogical means of distinguishing between understandings of development and underdevelopment. The diffusion model usually associates with established views while the dependency model relates to radical views of Latin America, some of which are bourgeois while others are Marxist. Contradictions and confusions in the perspectives related to the dependency model, however, make necessary a close examination of bourgeois and Marxist criteria, as identified in the figure.

Distinctions between bourgeois and Marxist criteria may help to clarify the contradictions and confusions in certain writings on dependency, some of which result from terminology. Some Marxists, seeking to influence radical bourgeois reformers, drew their terminology from bourgeois social science. As a consequence, these Marxist writers associated dependentistas with non-Marxist perspectives of imperialism, while those unfamiliar with Marxist writing frequently assumed that dependentistas were Marxist because of common opposition to foreign investment (Harding 1976, p. 4).

The bourgeois view manifests a concern with the building of national capitalism within the context of international imperialism. Reform of capitalism through understanding of and struggle with dependency, it is believed, can lead to independent national development. Dependent social classes such as the national bourgeoisie may become autonomous through such national development. Thus the national bourgeoisie may emerge as the dominant class and will promote the interests of the nation within a pattern of dependent development. In turn the state may reinforce the struggle against dependency.

The Marxist view understands that the elimination of dependency must be associated with the struggle of workers to supplant the private owners of the means of production. Such struggle will bring workers into conflict with the national bourgeoisie and lead not to capitalist development but to the destruction of the capitalist system. Thus, the national bourgeoisie is unable to become autonomous through national development, but instead finds itself in conflict with other class interests. A Marxist interpretation of capitalist development is based on laws rooted in the mode of production and class struggle. In this view,

Perspectives of Dependency

	<i>The Bourgeois View</i>	<i>The Marxist View</i>
Struggle	Overcoming dependency may lead to national (capitalist) development.	Overcoming the private owners' means of production leads to destruction of the capitalist system and to socialist development.
Classes	Become autonomous through national development. Emphasis on oligarchies and bourgeoisies, middle sectors with national bourgeoisie as essential class.	Become conflictual. Emphasis on feudal, bourgeois, and proletarian classes with proletariat as essential class.
Capitalist Development	Based on patterns that distinguish dependent from classical capitalism.	Based on laws rooted in modes of production, social relations of production, and class struggle.
State	Serves the nation in the struggle to eliminate dependency.	Serves the ruling class in preservation of capitalist development and national dependence.
Imperialism	Associated with political and military expansion that explains exploitation of dominant nations over dependent nations.	Associated with monopoly stage of capitalism, reflecting the ultimate development of contradictions in the capitalist mode of production.

the capitalist mode and the state will be eliminated through the struggle of workers to achieve a humanized society.

The need to distinguish sharply between bourgeois and Marxist views of dependency is emphasized and explored by Agustín Cueva (1976) with a number of pertinent examples. Cueva argues, first, that Frank fails to root his discussion of capitalism in an analysis of prevailing modes of production so that his insistence that capitalism has prevailed throughout Latin America since the sixteenth century abandons Marx's own notion of capitalism. Second, Rodolfo Stavenhagen originally offered a dualist conception of internal colonialism in which traditional rural and modern urban sectors were contrasted; later Stavenhagen related his concept to modes of production. However, Cueva suggests that questions of class conflict and exploitation are replaced by concern for regional and national differences, thus conferring on dependency "a nationalist character." Third, while dependency theory critiques bourgeois economics, it

also becomes entrapped by traditional developmental thinking—questions of class conflict and exploitation are replaced by a search for balanced development and the assumption that such development could take place under capitalism rather than socialism. Fourth, Cueva feels that Dos Santos confuses the worldwide expansion of capitalism, which was stressed by Lenin, with economic growth in the periphery. Fifth, he believes that Cardoso and Enzo Falleto ambiguously mix Marxist and *desarrollista* theoretical frameworks and ignore some historical considerations in their treatment of Latin America.

Given these contradictions and the lack of any unified theory of dependency, I outline below two tasks for Marxist theory that incorporate a view of dependency. One seeks conceptual clarity, the other relates theory to actual experience.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

While interpretations of dependency often reflect the view that imperialism has promoted capitalism throughout the Third World, thereby obstructing local and national bourgeoisies from gaining autonomous control, these interpretations rarely analyze the notion that imperialism has created the need for a socialist revolution led by the working class and peasantry. That socialism might be achieved without a profound capitalist expansion led by the national bourgeoisie argues against the position of the Communist parties as well as against the inadequate bourgeois theory of nationalist development. These interpretations, however, fail to elaborate revolutionary theory. Such theory demands clarification of historical materialism, the class struggle, and imperialism.

Essential to a Marxist view of dependency would be a conception of *historical materialism*. Marx perceived materialism as the basis of all history. Materialism includes the means and modes by which people reproduce their existence through production. While Marx concerned himself with a critical interpretation of bourgeois modes of production, he also analyzed societies whose modes of production manifested "Asiatic, ancient, and feudal" characteristics. Examining various periods of history, Marx referred not only to *modes of production* but to *relations of production* and *forces of production*. He related these terms to underlying social circumstances that permitted change. Change occurred in the transformations affecting the dominant mode of production. Change for Marx was a reflection of dialectical contradiction in diverse social forces emerging from conflict.

Marx differentiated between the base (sometimes called the substructure or infrastructure) and the superstructure of society. The *base* comprises productive forces and the social relations of production built upon them; that is, the productive forces and the control and ownership of the means of production determine divisions of labor that separate some members from other members of society. The legal and political *superstructure* consists of low or high levels of conceptions that people have about the world. Such conceptions are dependent upon the base; they may be ideologies, reflecting false consciousness. Masking

these ideologies is the state, which, Marx argued, perpetuates a hierarchical class structure, thereby protecting the interests of the ruling class. The ruling class rules economically through its ownership and control of the means of production; consequently it also rules politically. Thus, under capitalism the state is the agency that maintains the property relations of the wealthy minority; as long as classes exist, the state does not stand above class, but is always on the side of the rulers. In the preface to his *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx summarized all these concepts:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political, and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production. . . . From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. . . . No social order is destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones before the material conditions for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society. . . . In broad outline, the Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production may be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society (Marx 1975, pp. 425–26).

Here are essential elements of Marx's thinking: modes of production, material forces and relations of production, superstructure and structural base, state and ruling class, ideology and reality. They are at the heart of a Marxist theory of development and deserve primary consideration in the incorporation of any view of dependency.

Marx did not fully elaborate a conception of class, although class analysis was a central concern of his work. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx briefly traced the history of class antagonism: patricians, knights, plebeians, and slaves under ancient Rome; feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs in the Middle Ages; bourgeoisie and proletariat under modern bourgeois capitalism. The role of the bourgeoisie under capitalism was to end feudal relations and old modes of production through "constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society" (Marx 1974, pp. 70–71). In contrast, the

proletariat, the working class “who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital,” are subservient to the bourgeoisie. This proletariat assimilates “the lower strata of the middle class—the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and *rentiers*, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which modern industry is carried on” (Marx 1974, p. 75).

In *The German Ideology*, Marx described the bourgeois ruling class as a force that rules materially over production and intellectually over ideas: “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the ruling *material* force of society, is at the same time its ruling *intellectual* force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that . . . the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it” (Marx and Engels 1973, p. 64).

In *The Class Struggles in France, 1848–1850* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx directly applied his conception of class to revolutionary events of the mid-nineteenth century. His analysis focused on such classes as finance aristocracy, industrial bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, lumpenproletariat, industrial proletariat, bourgeois monarchy, big bourgeoisie.

Finally, in a brief and incomplete last chapter of the third volume of *Capital*, Marx attempted an explicit definition of classes: “Wage-labourers, capitalists and landowners constitute the three big classes of modern society based upon the capitalist mode of production.” He urged caution in stratifying classes, even in highly developed England where differences between bourgeoisie and proletariat were conspicuous: “Middle and intermediate strata even here obliterate lines of demarcation everywhere.” Then he acknowledged the existence of less important classes: physicians and bureaucrats represented separate interests, while capitalists and landlords split “into owners of vineyards, farm owners, owners of forests, mine owners and owners of fisheries” (Marx 1967, 3, pp. 885–86).

This cursory review of Marx’s writings is not meant to be definitive or even an attempt at a reconstruction of Marx’s theory of classes and class struggle. It is clear, though, that Marx’s own analysis of class was neither doctrinaire nor deterministic and that he applied his criteria more prudently than did many of his followers.

Imperialism is another conceptual concern for those attempting to relate Marxist theory to a view of dependency. Theories of imperialism since the ideas of the English liberal J. A. Hobson assume an inequality between dominant and dependent nations. Even Lenin’s refinement of imperialism as a concept took into account dependency. In *Imperialism, The Highest State of Capitalism*, he referred to dependency:

Since we are speaking of colonial policy in the epoch of capitalist imperialism, it must be observed that finance capital and its foreign policy, which is the struggle of the great powers for the economic

and political division of the world, give rise to a number of *transitional* forms of state dependence. . . . Not only are there two main groups of countries, those owning colonies, and the colonies themselves, but also the diverse forms of dependent countries which, politically, are formally independent, but in fact, are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence (Lenin 1967, 1, pp. 742–43).

Thus, dependentistas can turn to Lenin for the theoretical underpinnings of their argument. Lenin makes clear the external impact of imperialism upon many nations, and he combines internal and external forces in his interpretation of reality faced by dependent nations.

Frequently writers using the term dependency have not made clear the relationship of their ideas to the Marxist and Leninist theory of imperialism, or they have distorted that theory. Some writers tend to relate imperialism to expansionism and to military and political rather than economic explanations in a context of capitalist global expansion and material production. Such explanations have resulted in confusions over terminology relating dependency to imperialism. Consequently, some Marxists have rejected a view of dependency, arguing that a Leninist concept had been revised or ignored altogether (Fernández and Ocampo 1974). Non-Marxists such as David Ray (1973) look at dependency among socialist countries while C. Richard Bath and Dilmus James (1976) call for a synthesis of radical and traditional approaches to dependency; both criticisms overlook the Marxist understanding of historical materialism and the Leninist view that imperialism reflects the ultimate development of contradictions in the capitalist mode of production. Johan Galtung's (1971) definition of imperialism in terms of harmony and disharmony of interest between nations of center and periphery has been well received, but his formulation tends to be schematic and jargonistic, drawing heavily from bourgeois social science.

Thus, the search for theory must begin with Lenin's thesis of imperialism. For Lenin, imperialism is simply the monopoly stage of capitalism; this stage combines finance capital of monopolist banks with capital of monopolist industrialists. Its features are fivefold: first, monopolies are decisive economically, the consequence of the concentration of production and capital; second, bank capital and industrial capital merge as "finance capital" under a "financial oligarchy"; third, the export of capital, as distinguished from the export of commodities, is especially significant; fourth, international monopolist capitalist associations dominate the world; and fifth, the large capitalist powers stake territorial divisions throughout the world (Lenin 1967, 1, pp. 745–46).

From Lenin, one might turn to other lines of thinking that have generated interest. The treatment of Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy (1966) serves as an updating of the earlier Leninist analysis of monopoly capitalism, while Harry Magdoff (1969) traces imperialism from its beginnings to the modern period and attempts to relate the imperialist activities of private enterprise to U.S. foreign policy. The attention to the impact of multinational corporations throughout the world provoked a debate in the journal *Socialist Revolution* (1970–71) around the issue of whether corporate capital has replaced finance capital as the dominant

form of capital in the contemporary world of imperialism. These lines of thinking represent attempts to refine and relate Lenin's thought to the world today.

RELATING THEORY TO EXPERIENCE

If conceptual clarity and refinement remain an essential task, then, too, Marxist theory that incorporates a view of dependency must relate to actual experience. Marx utilized a flexible dialectical method that emphasized continuous revision of theory according to new facts as well as the interpretation of new facts according to new theory. Marx's materialism stressed the grounding of theory in the facts of historical reality. He carefully separated the material base of successive generations of history from all idealistic views of history and argued that the materialist view "remains constantly on the real *ground* of history," while the idealistic view explains "practice from the idea" (Marx and Engels 1973, p. 58). Marx believed that in history human consciousness is conditioned on the dialectical interplay of human beings and the material world. Accordingly history is a continuous process of creating and satisfying human needs. Once needs are satisfied, new needs are created.

There are some attempts to apply assumptions of dependency to case studies in Latin America. Frank (1967) offered an historical analysis of Brazil and Chile. The country essays in Chilcote and Edelstein (1974) combine ideas of dependency with Marxist theory in an examination of the historical experiences of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Guatemala, and Mexico. James Petras (1973) offers useful case studies on Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, while Cardoso (1971) looks at dependency in terms of empirical investigation carried out in Argentina and Brazil. Prior to the 1973 military coup in Chile, Dos Santos headed a team of researchers who were applying aspects of dependency to particular situations in Latin America. However, the task of undertaking rigorous study in Latin America continues. Marxist theory has been loosely applied to Latin America, usually in abstract and generalized terms. Likewise, verification of many assumptions of dependency remains to be demonstrated in terms of Latin America's historical experience.

The Latin Americanist interested in Marxist theory and dependency might benefit from a reading of the work of Samir Amin, which recently has been translated to English. In his two-volume study of capitalist accumulation, Amin (1974) attacks bourgeois thinking, refines Marxist and Leninist interpretations of development and underdevelopment in the center, and sets forth a new theory of capitalism in the periphery. A more recent essay on unequal development (1976) clearly elaborates on this theory. Amin has attempted to relate a Marxist theory to dependency, to clarify conceptualization, and to resolve theoretical issues on the left as well as to illustrate his theory with concrete examples of historical experience in the contemporary world, including Latin America. Amin's ambitious efforts have been critiqued for obscuring the class struggle and for emphasis on market and circulation rather than on relations of production, charges that he has dismissed as "hasty arguments which ignore the full scope" of his writings, many of which have not yet been published in English (Amin 1977).

In conclusion, I have outlined the contribution that a view of dependency has brought to our understanding of development and underdevelopment in Latin America. I have identified the basis of some confusions that emanate from the model of dependency. I have demonstrated the need to differentiate between bourgeois and Marxist criteria in assessment of the dependentistas. Finally I have emphasized two tasks for Marxist theory that attempt to incorporate a view of dependency.

REFERENCES

AMIN, SAMIR

- 1974 *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*, 2 vols. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- 1976 *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Reformations of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- 1977 "Comment on Gerstein," *Insurgent Sociologist* 7 (Spring):99–103. Reply to critic Ira Gerstein, who contributed "Theories of the World Economy and Imperialism," pp. 9–22 in the same issue.

BARAN, PAUL, and PAUL SWEETZ

- 1966 *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

BATH, C. RICHARD, and DILMUS D. JAMES

- 1976 "Dependency Analysis of Latin America." *LARR* 11, no. 3 (Fall):3–54.

CARDOSO, FERNANDO HENRIQUE

- 1971 *Política e desenvolvimento em sociedades dependentes*. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca de Ciências Sociais, Zahar Editores.
- 1972 "Dependency and Development in Latin America." *New Left Review* 74 (July–August):83–95.
- 1973 "Associated Dependent Development: Theoretical and Practical Implications." In *Authoritarian Brazil: Origins, Policies, and Future*, ed. Alfred Stepan. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, pp. 142–76.

CHILCOTE, RONALD H.

- 1974 "Dependency: A Critical Synthesis of the Literature." *Latin American Perspectives* 1 (Spring):4–29.
- Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm*. New York: Free Press, forthcoming.

CHILCOTE, RONALD H., and JOEL C. EDELSTEIN (eds.)

- 1974 *Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing. Chap. 1: "Alternative Perspectives of Development and Underdevelopment in Latin America."

CUEVA, AGUSTÍN

- 1976 "A Summary of 'Problems and Perspectives of Dependency Theory.'" *Latin American Perspectives* 3 (Fall):12–16.

DOS SANTOS, THEOTONIO

- 1970 "The Structure of Dependence." *American Economic Review* 60 (May):231–36.
- 1976 "The Crisis of Contemporary Capitalism." *Latin American Perspectives* 3 (Spring):84–99.

FERNÁNDEZ, RAÚL A., and JOSÉ F. OCAMPO

- 1974 "The Latin American Revolution: A Theory of Imperialism, Not Dependence." *Latin American Perspectives* 2 (Fall):19–35.

FRANK, ANDRÉ GUNDER

- 1967 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

GALTUNG, JOHAN

- 1971 "A Structural Theory of Imperialism." *Journal of Peace Research* 13, no. 2:81–117.

Latin American Research Review

HARDING, TIMOTHY F.

- 1976 "Dependency, Nationalism and the State in Latin America." *Latin American Perspectives* 3 (Fall):3–11.

KUHN, THOMAS S.

- 1970 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LENIN, V. I.

- 1967 *Selected Works in Three Volumes*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

MAGDOFF, HARRY

- 1969 *The Age of Imperialism: The Economics of U.S. Foreign Policy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

MARX, KARL

- 1967 *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, 3 vols. New York: International Publishers.

- 1974 *Surveys from Exile*, ed. David Fernbach. New York: Vintage Books.

- 1975 *Early Writings*. New York: Vintage Books.

MARX, KARL, and FREDERICK ENGELS

- 1973 *The German Ideology*, ed. C. J. Arthur. New York: International Publishers.

PETRAS, JAMES (ed.)

- 1973 *Latin America: From Dependence to Revolution*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

RAY, DAVID

- 1973 "The Dependency Model of Latin American Underdevelopment: Three Basic Fallacies." *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 15 (February): 21–35.

RODNEY, WALTER

- 1972 *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London and Dar es Salaam: Bogle-L'Ouverture and Tanzania Publishing House.