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INTRODUCTION

The following synthesis attempts to identify the major tendencies in the dependency literature and to introduce the reader to the major works and issues on the subject. Ronald Chilcote is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Riverside.

DEPENDENCY: A CRITICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE LITERATURE

by

Ronald H. Chilcote

Over the past decade a new perspective of development and underdevelopment has emerged. Labelled by its advocates as dependency theory, this perspective focuses on the problem of foreign penetration in the political economies of Latin America. Generally, this theory explains underdevelopment throughout Latin America as a consequence of outside economic and political influence. More specifically, the economy of certain nations is believed to be conditioned by the relationship to another economy which is dominant and capable of expanding and developing. Thus the interdependence of such economies assumes contrasting forms of dominance and dependence so that dependent nations might develop as a reflection of the expansion of dominant nations or underdevelop as a consequence of their subjective relationship. This explanation approximates the definition of dependency offered by Dos Santos (1968:6) who states:

By dependence we mean 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. The relation of inter-dependence between two or more economies, and between these and world trade, assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant ones) can expand and can be self-sustaining, while other countries (the dependent ones) can do this only as a reflection of that expansion, which can have either a positive or a negative effect on their immediate development.

In more specific terms, Osvaldo Sunkel (1972:519) elaborates on this interpretation:

... foreign factors are seen not as external but as intrinsic to the system, with manifold and sometimes hidden or subtle political, financial, economic, technical and cultural effects inside the underdeveloped country ... Thus, the concept of “dependencia” links the postwar evolution of capitalism internationally to the discriminatory nature of the local process of development, as we know it. Access to the means and benefits of development is selective; rather than spreading them, the process tends to ensure a self-reinforcing accumulation of privilege for special groups as well as the continued existence of a marginal class.

These definitions are central to an understanding of dependency, for like other theory in an infant stage, dependency theory has spawned a plethora of interpretations and applications and has been adopted by ideologues on all sides of the political spectrum. However, initial comprehension of the theory should revolve around the relationships of nations, one to the other in terms of dominance versus dependence.

Dependency theory quickly caught the attention of Latin Americans and more recently it has come under wide acceptance by others, both in Europe and the United States. There have been criticisms of the theory, from left and right circles. Perhaps more important, a number of thrusts have emerged in the ever-
expanding literature that has ensued. In this essay I trace the impact of dependency theory upon three personal academic experiences I have shared with colleagues and students. I mention these to illustrate how the theory serves as an understanding of Latin America; how it motivates students to confront the complexities of Latin America; and how it provoked the editors of the present journal to reassess its importance in the face of determined efforts on the part of many scholars to disregard it altogether. I also elaborate on the evolution of the theory and identify the major thrusts in the literature on dependency. Finally, I examine several assumptions, suggested in the literature, and critically examine these in the light of crucial issues which have divided advocates of dependency theory.

First, I turn to three personal experiences to show how dependency theory has affected my own thinking and recent involvement in Latin American studies. The present essay is partly prompted by my having to review the rather extensive literature in an effort to advance my understanding of the theory and at the same time to convey this understanding to students interested in Latin America. This resulted in a collaborative essay (Chilcote and Edelstein, 1974) which focused on two alternative explanations advanced by observers of Latin America. One argued that the development of areas like Latin America will come about through outside influence and assistance; we called it the diffusion model. The other viewed foreign penetration as the cause of underdevelopment; this we called the dependency model. We juxtaposed these two models by examining their essential premises and their contrasting assumptions about development and underdevelopment. We related these models to the historical experience in Europe, especially in England and in the Iberian countries, as well as in Latin America. We were able to demonstrate how different analyses of development and underdevelopment in Latin America correlate to one’s reliance upon either the diffusionist or dependency model. Further, we traced these differences through a critique of three major interpretations of Latin America by Latin American scholars, thereby exemplifying how use of the models led to different conclusions.

Since traditional explanations of Latin America tend to relate to the diffusion model and because my own understanding is premised on the dependency model, I found the above approach useful as a way of involving students. This involvement took place on two levels: undergraduate and graduate. The contrasting models were presented to two undergraduate courses. In the first course a description of each model was worked out through dialogue and study. Then, four issues which differentiate the models were identified. Reading and discussion focused on literature relating to each issue but stressing one model or the other. The question of the existence of a dual society in Latin America was of particular concern, for example, as was the role of (or existence of) a national bourgeoisie. We critically examined the contrasting positions on the role of a ruling class, and we speculated on the possibility of a classless society. To illustrate the analytical implications of the two models, we studied the interpretations of Pablo González Casanova, José Luis Imaz, and Aníbal Quijano, respectively of Mexico, Argentina, and Peru. This intensive study made students aware of the theoretical underpinnings, albeit biases and value judgments, of Latin American writers who sometimes work in the diffusionist tradition of contemporary social science yet accept many of the assumptions of the dependency model. The exercise tended to clarify perspectives and lead students to new insights and in-depth analysis. The pedagogical implications of this approach are described elsewhere (Chilcote, Gorman, Le Roy, and Sheehan, 1974).
A similar approach was attempted in a graduate seminar on Latin American political economy, resulting in an immediate rejection of the premises of the diffusion model and a serious effort at understanding, interpreting, and applying dependency theory to Latin America today. The ten graduate students decided to identify major weaknesses in dependency theory and through study and writing to suggest ways of strengthening the theory. Their point of departure was the collective effort undertaken at Stanford University during 1972, in particular the collection of papers edited by Frank Bonilla and Robert Girling (1973) and reviewed in the present issue by Terry Dietz-Fee and Gilbert González. The Riverside seminar also produced a lengthy paper which revolved around a series of questions relating to weaknesses in the existing dependency theory (see Le Roy et al., 1973).* One question was directed to a critical reassessment of internal colonialism in the light of theories of dependency and imperialism. We found, however, that the examination of this topic prompted more questions than answers. Another concern related to the significance of ruling classes in the literature on dependency, for it was believed that the theory had tended to overlook an analysis of the Latin American ruling class as a dependent bourgeoisie which rules in the interest of world imperialism. Still another issue was that of socialism and dependency with specific reference to criticism implying that the independence of underdeveloped socialist countries is impossible because they become dependent upon the developed socialist metropoles. The response to this argument, presented by Guy Gilbert in the present journal issue, shows that dominance of the socialist metropolis is fundamentally different than that manifested by the capitalist powers. A final question dealt with the struggle to break with and to move beyond dependency. Chile and Peru were selected as case studies and analysis was directed at the measures employed by these nations to break their dependent relationship with capitalism and imperialism. The Riverside product demonstrated that persons with different backgrounds and ideologies could work together collectively on a common theme. More important perhaps was that the challenge of dependency theory, the awareness of its strengths and weaknesses, and the use of an alternative model all served to stimulate and motivate a group of graduate students to become deeply involved not only in understanding the problems of Latin America but in trying to work out critical perspectives that might lend themselves to solutions.

A desire to resolve some of the difficulties and confusions in dependency theory stimulated the early efforts of the journal collective in founding Latin American Perspectives and in putting together this first number. At our first meeting in March 1973 there was a quick consensus on the need for a new journal, but very little agreement in a lengthy dialogue on dependency theory. Raúl Fernández and José Ocampo forcefully presented their attack on the dependentist- as. Certainly a majority disagreed with them at the time and probably continue to disagree today. Our disagreements, however, brought us together. First, we recognized the need for a critical yet constructive reevaluation of the dependentistas and their theory. Second, we felt that our dialogue and experience should be exposed to others. The present journal issue serves to update the discussion on dependency. It should be apparent that we have not resolved many questions. Hopefully, however, the different ideas and approaches contained herein will serve to stimulate new inquiry and dialogue. In that spirit, I turn now to a synthesis of the literature

*A limited number of copies of the Riverside paper are available for $1.50 which covers production, handling, and mailing costs. Address inquiries and payment to this journal, P. O. Box 5703, Riverside, CA 92507.
on dependency. In particular, I review the theoretical directions evident in the literature as well as the principal criticisms that have accompanied each direction. Later, I look at descriptive and empirical efforts to validate some propositions that emanate from the literature.

THEORETICAL DIRECTIONS

The literature on dependency moves in many directions and criticisms emerge from a variety of ideological positions. Clearly dependency theory is eclectic in nature. Some dependency theorists focus on assumptions about a progressive bourgeois whose nationalist inclinations serve as a foundation for opposing outside influence. Some critics oppose dependency theory on the grounds that it focuses on external dependency and thereby avoids consideration of internal class struggle. Others argue that the theory obscures analysis of imperialism.

In all the writings of dependency only two offer a synthesis of the many directions and positions. Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1973c) provides the most recent of these. He finds the foundation for the concept in the writings of Lenin and Trotsky, then attempts to relate these classical formulations to the literature of the past decade. He notes three tendencies in the recent literature. One concentrates on analysis which critiques the obstacles to national development, a good example being the publications of the Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (ISEB), established in the middle fifties to study and introduce to Brazilian society a new conception of nationalism and development. Helio Jaguaribe (1970), a founder of ISEB, has carried this tradition forward in his view that Latin America faces three alternatives: dependency, autonomy or revolution. Dependency will be overcome, he argues through autonomous national development and non-revolutionary change. This view of development falls into what above I called the diffusion model; it has been criticized by Frank (1967b), Theotônio dos Santos (1970a), and Cardoso (1965). A second tendency incorporates analysis on international capitalism in its monopolistic phase. The thrust of this tendency springs from Marx and Lenin, especially the latter. Refinements and elaboration of the early ideas were offered by Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy (Baran, 1957; Baran and Sweezy, 1966); and Harry Magdoff (1969) effectively ties theory to fact in contemporary world affairs. A raging debate from differing perspectives is found in recent issues of Socialist Revolution; particularly noteworthy are the views of Robert Fitch who is critical of Baran and Sweezy’s corporate model. The third tendency identified by Cardoso attempts to describe “a historical structural process of dependency in terms of class relations, tying the economy and International politics to corresponding local factors which in turn generate internal contradictions and political struggle . . . .” Cardoso’s own contributions fall into this tendency.

Claire Savit Bacha (1971) has contributed the other synthesis of the literature in a study that embraces theory and relates to the Brazilian experience. She examines five conceptions of dependency as elaborated in the writings of Vasconci, Lenin, Frank, Dos Santos, and Cardoso. Let us briefly examine each conceptualization.

Bacha describes the effort by Tomás Vasconci (1969a) as oriented to a “systematization of the concept of dependency.” Vasconci’s conceptualization of dependency relates to distinctions between underdevelopment and development, on the one hand, and between the center and the periphery, on the other. Dependency,
he argues, permits one to see the center and the periphery as parts of a capitalist structure, this structure being a system of relations of international interdependence. Accordingly, a central economy expands as it reaches the peripheral economy, incorporating it within that system. Vasconi then suggests a number of propositions. First, dependent nations may or may not develop, but the process of development can lead to a rupture in the ties of dependence. Second, dependency is determined historically. Third, dependency includes all internal and external forces that historically affect a nation, forming its structures in relation to its historical and international position. Vasconi elaborates. During the development of capitalism, he says, dependent nations are isolated from the center. These peripheral nations remain dependent until they break their dependent relations, but in either case they may or may not experience development. Changes in dependent relationships, however, are tied to historical forces.

Another major conceptualization of dependency is closely tied to imperialism. Both concepts deal with relations between the center and the periphery and both explain underdevelopment. Drawing upon Hobson and others, Lenin refined the concept of imperialism as the consequence of capitalism itself. Monopoly capital, he argued, needed to export its surplus of capital, to search for new external markets, and to expand profit-making opportunities. Lenin identified two types of nations: imperialist and dominated nations and he referred in his work to the concept of 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 dependency . . . (Lenin, 1967, Vol. 1:742-743).

Thus, dependentistas can turn to Lenin for the theoretical underpinnings of their argument. Lenin makes clear the external imposition that imperialist nations force upon many nations, and by also focusing on dependency, he is able to combine internal with external forces in interpreting the national reality of a dependent nation.

Economist André Gunder Frank offers a third conceptualization of dependency. In his early work (1967), Frank affirms that “it is capitalism, both world and national, which produced underdevelopment in the past and which still generates underdevelopment in the present.” His analysis centers on the metropolis-satellite structure of the capitalist system as he traces throughout the history of certain countries the development of underdevelopment. He identifies the internal contradictions of capitalism as “the expropriation of economic surplus from the many and its appropriation by the few, the polarization of the capitalist system into metropolitan center and peripheral satellites, and the continuity of the fundamental structure of the capitalist system throughout the history of its expansion and transformation . . .” His central thesis focuses on these contradictions; capitalism, he argues, has “generated underdevelopment in the peripheral satellites whose economic surplus was expropriated, while generating economic development in the metropolitan centers which appropriate that surplus.” With this thesis, Frank suggests a series of hypotheses which contend with some literature which explains backwardness through a dualist model of society and advocates change through a progressive national bourgeois. His critique of these ideas set in motion new thinking and provoked a multitude of criticisms, some of which he
answers in this journal. Further, Frank concentrates attention on exploitation, thereby turning attention to the internal consequences of nations caught up in dustrial dependence.”

A fourth conceptualization offers a further refinement. Known as the “New Dependency” and elaborated by Brazilian sociologist Theotonio dos Santos (1968), this conceptualization differs from colonial dependency, based on trade export, and from financial-industrial dependency, characterized by the domination of big capital in the hegemonic centers at the end of the nineteenth century. The new dependency is a recent phenomenon, based on multinational corporations which after the Second World War invested in industries geared to the internal market of underdeveloped countries. Dos Santos characterizes it as a “technological-industrial dependence.”

Finally, Bacha turns to the early work of Cardoso and Faletto (1969) on dependency. They stress internal structure. For example, classes or groups are analyzed in relation to the structure of outside domination. Dependency, therefore, is viewed not only as an external variable but within “a system of relations among different social classes in an environment characteristic of dependent nations.” Like Frank and Dos Santos, they trace dependency through history. They also criticize the economic emphasis of these writers, and attempt to elaborate on theory by suggesting that politics and the internal forces are more decisive than economics and external forces in determining forms of dependency. Their own approach embraces these four levels of analysis: internal and external, political and economic.

Bacha observes that there are as many conceptions of dependency as there are authors, that the proponents of the theory work at various levels of analysis, and that there are limitations to the formulation of a workable conceptualization. No single author is able to apply the theory to all levels of analysis which pervade the literature. Most authors fail to define external components of their theory, tending instead to rely upon a national perspective. Relations among structural elements are not explicitly identified. Bacha believes that such inconsistencies account for the varying conclusions reached by different writers of dependency. While none of the writers affirms the possibility of autonomous capitalist development, Lenin admits the existence of capitalist development within the dominant countries, Dos Santos looks for autonomous development in some countries after industrialization, and Cardoso, Faletto, and Vasconi acknowledge that some development can occur in a state of dependency. Frank, in contrast, sees persistent underdevelopment as the outcome of the dominated countries.

My own synthesis of the dependency theory builds upon the earlier efforts of Cardoso and Bacha. I shall recast the categories to reflect the evolution of the literature from the early conceptualization until the present time. Rather than focus on particular writers, I concern myself with two thrusts and six formulations which seem to stand out in the literature. The thrusts revolve around distinctions between the diffusionist and dependency models mentioned earlier while the formulations relate to one or the other model. These formulations are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Indeed they overlap, but they are representative of particular theoretical directions. I now turn to a discussion of each in an effort to identify major theoretical works, attempts to implement the theory, and critical assessment.
The Diffusion Model and the ECLA and Internal Colony Formulations

The diffusion model embraces a number of fundamental premises. Progress comes about through the spread of modernism to backward areas. Inescapably these areas evolve from a traditional toward a modern state as technology and capital are introduced. Underdevelopment is a condition which all nations have experienced at one time. Some nations have managed to develop, while others have not. In some underdeveloped nations, modern cities have arisen through contact with the developed world, while the countryside maintains a system of unproductive agriculture of large feudal estates.

These premises lead to two controversial propositions. One is that developing nations are structured into dual societies, one advanced and modern and the other backward and feudal. The other proposition suggests that in the advanced society there will emerge a new bourgeoisie, commercial and industrial in character. This bourgeoisie may become progressive and a supporter of national interests as capitalist development diffuses itself into rural areas and as economic and political policies restrict the domination and penetration of foreign interests. Both propositions are embraced, at least partially, by two formulations which sometimes are linked to the foundations of dependency theory. These formulations were proposed, on the one hand, by the United Nations' Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and, on the other by advocates of internal colonialism.

The ECLA school of thought evolved after the Second World War. It was nationalist and sometimes anti-imperialist but non-Marxist in orientation. Its analysis sprang from Latin American economists grouped around the Argentine, Raúl Prebisch. Their philosophy was shaped by beliefs and principles set forth in a manifesto on development (United Nations, ECLA, 1950). The history of the ECLA movement dates from its manifesto and breaks into three phases: from 1950 to 1953 when its ideology was formed, elaborated, and tested; from 1953 until 1958 when intensive studies were made of individual Latin American countries with the objective of proposing plans for their future development; and since 1958 when attention shifted to the study and promotion of regional integration through formation of a common market. The ECLA thesis divides the world into an industrial center and a primary producing periphery, both of which should benefit from the maximizing of production, income, and consumption. However, unrestrained competition tends to result in appropriation to the center of most of the increment in world income. In short, the thesis correctly links Latin American underdevelopment to the international economic system, and thus affirms an underlying assumption of dependency theory. But analysis also is limited. For example, the thesis neglects an adequate examination of the conscious policies and specific needs of the nations of the center; it mistakenly attributes Latin American backwardness to traditional or feudal oligarchies; it inappropriately assumes that development would be promoted by a progressive, nationalist bourgeoisie, an assumption thus far negated by historical experience; and its stress on import substitution as a solution to consumptive dependence on the outside world has resulted in even greater dependence on the international system and in economic stagnation.

Theories of internal colonialism relate to dependency. The early work of the Mexican sociologist, Pablo González Casanova (1970), proposed a framework for analysis of internal colonialism. With the elimination of traditional forms of colonialism, characterized by foreign domination over nations, he suggests that the
same conditions of the past colonialism may be found internally: “With the disappearance of the direct domination of foreigners over natives, the notion of domination and exploitation of natives by natives emerges.” He describes the forms of internal colonialism, focusing on monopoly and dependence (the metropolis dominates the isolated communities, creating deformation of the native economy and decapitalization); relations of production and social control (exploitation plunders lands and discriminates everywhere); and culture and living standards (subsistence economies accentuate poverty, backward techniques, low productivity, lack of services, and traditionalism).

González Casanova stresses internal conditions of colonialism and suggests that external conditions no longer have great impact in Mexico. His formulation is similar in this respect to the culture of poverty thesis of Oscar Lewis (1964). Lewis attempts to demonstrate through his experience in poor Mexican and Puerto Rican communities that the culture of poverty applies to those people at the bottom of the socio-economic scale, the poorest workers, the poorest peasants and plantation laborers, and others. These people are marginal, have low levels of education and literacy, suffer from unemployment and underemployment as well as the absence of food supplies in the home. They experience a sense of resignation and fatalism based on the reality of their life situation. These traits are precisely those recognized by González Casanova. They are very similar to the conditions of colonized peoples described, in the case of French Algeria by Frantz Fanon and of French Tunisia by Albert Memmi. At one point Fanon (1967:83-108) writes about the “so-called dependency complex of colonized peoples” and asserts that this form of dependency emerges as a psychological response to a colonial situation, not a phenomenon that antedates colonialization, as some observers believe. Memmi draws a portrait of the colonizer and the colonized; he clarifies the differences between the two: “One is disfigured into an oppressor, a partial, unpatriotic and treacherous being, worrying only about his privileges and their defense; and the other, into an oppressed creature, whose development is broken and who compromises by his defeat” (Memmi, 1965:89).

These writers emphasize the forms or conditions of colonialism. Our selection of examples of colonialism and internal colonialism suggests that González Casanova’s stress on internal aspects alone may be misleading. He believes that marginal peoples will be absorbed into a collective society through the formation of a national bourgeoisie. Lewis speaks of the defense mechanisms without which the poor could not carry on, for the culture of poverty, he feels, is “a way of life, remarkably stable and persistent, passed down from generation to generation along family lines.” Memmi provides two answers for the colonized: assimilation and revolt, but he offers no strategy for revolution. In a preface to Memmi’s work, Jean-Paul Sartre describes the struggle against colonialism: “And when a people has no choice but how it will die; when a people has received from its oppressors only the gift of despair, what does it have to lose? A people’s misfortune will become its courage; it will make, of its endless rejection by colonialism, the absolute rejection of colonialization” (Memmi, 1965: xxix). Fanon is perhaps most instructive in this respect for his insights and understandings of colonial oppression are based on a struggle for national liberation. He is able to combine an identification of forms and conditions with an understanding and interpretation of the violent phenomenon of decolonialization (see especially Fanon, 1963 and 1965).

Internal colonialism has interested those concerned with the situation of
racial minorities in the United States: Chicanos, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, and others. Some of the conceptual problems alluded to above have provoked a division in the ranks of scholars studying these internal colonies. Most agree that classical conceptions of colonialism were too narrow for contemporary analysis. Some scholars believe that contemporary dependency theory and much radical analysis overlook the issue of race. Studies which seem to move in this direction include those on the Chicano (see Almaguer, 1971 and Barrera, Muñoz, and Ornelas, 1972), on the Black (see especially Blauner, 1969 and Harris, 1972), and on the Puerto Rican (see Oliver, 1972). This position is explicitly stated by Frank Bonilla who argues that “the most penetrating critique of dependency theory as it now stands was a by-product of the effort to assess its applicability to the case of racially stigmatized communities in the U.S.” (Bonilla and Girling, 1973:5). He feels that dependency theory ignores the “national question,” that it fails to contend with questions regarding internal differentiation. He is particularly critical of “the incomplete and controversial treatment in Marxist analysis of certain key categories—ethnicity, caste, culture, racism, and nationalism.” Students in Bonilla’s seminar at Stanford University during 1972 attempted to grapple with this problem, and while there were many conceptual problems in the analysis which ensued, their contributions move toward Marxist categories, not in Bonilla’s direction. The essay by Guillermo V. Flores (Bonilla and Girling, 1973:189-222), for example, breaks internal colonialism into three components (economic domination, racial-cultural domination, and political and institutional domination) reminiscent of González Casanova’s categories. At the same time he turns to concepts such as surplus value (which he converts to “racial-cultural surplus value”), class position, and cultural dependency and alienation in an obvious attempt to reconcile his focus on the racial question with Marx, Baran, and some dependentistas. In his conclusions, González Casanova refers to “monopoly capitalism turned inward” and to the need “to resist capitalist exploitation within the heart of imperialism’s most powerful nation.” This eclectic approach apparently was unsatisfactory to most Chicano scholars who during the spring of 1973 met at Irvine, California, and concluded that they would do well to consider abandoning the concept of internal colonialism altogether. This sentiment runs through the critique offered by Gilbert González in the present journal issue.

The Dependency Model: Four Formulations

The dependency model distinguishes underdeveloped Latin America from pre-capitalist Europe. It does not view underdevelopment as an original condition, but instead assumes that nations may once have been undeveloped but never underdeveloped and that the contemporary underdevelopment of many parts of Latin America was created by the same process of capitalism that brought development to the industrialized nations. Latin America is underdeveloped because it has supported the development of Western Europe and the United States. When the center of the expanding world economic system needed raw materials, it was supplied by Latin America. This relationship has not basically changed, even though the United States has replaced Great Britain as the metropolis which dominates over the area, resulting in a strengthening of dependency through foreign corporate and governmental penetration of banking, manufacturing, retailing, communications, advertising, and education. Within each country the pattern of metropolis-periphery relations is replicated as the economic surplus of the countryside drains into urban areas.
These premises lead dependentistas to a number of propositions. First, they argue that while feudalistic conditions and relationships exist, the backwardness of the countryside cannot be explained by the image of a dual society. Rural areas are poor not because of feudalism but because they have been responsive to urban and international market influences. The consequence has been the enrichment of the cities and the dominant nations. Second, dependentistas assert that the capitalist link between the city and the countryside is characterized by commerce between landowners and merchants who form an agro-commercial bourgeoisie which is subject to the market forces of a national and international capitalist economy. Empirical evidence verifies that agriculture, financial, and industrial interests are often found in the same economic groups, the same firms, and even in the same families. Thus, the capital of archaic latifundia may be invested by their owners in lucrative enterprise in the cities; or the grand families of the city, associated with foreign capital, may also be the owners of the backward latifundias. Thus, the landowning aristocracy and the urban commercial bourgeoisie often align with the manufacturing bourgeoisie. Third, dependentistas believe that dominant class interests are dependent on world imperialism for the manufacture of some goods, for foreign currency, and for foreign capital. Even if a segment of this class manifests nationalist xenophobia or resentment against imperialism, it has no other choice than to accept its condition as a dependent bourgeoisie. (The clearest case for these propositions is in Quijano's analysis of contemporary Peru—see 1971b). Let us now examine four formulations of dependency theory which relate to the above propositions. These formulations relate to directions in the literature which we might label 1) the development of underdevelopment; 2) the new dependency; 3) dependency and development; and 4) dependency and imperialism.

*The Development of Underdevelopment.* The bulk of writing during the past decade has focused on the development of underdevelopment. The thesis was most explicitly set forth in the early writing of André Gunder Frank (1966 and fully elaborated in 1967). He emphasized commercial monopoly rather than feudalism and pre-capitalist forms as the economic means whereby national and regional metropolises exploit and appropriate the economic satellites. Thus, capitalism on a world scale produces a developing metropolis and an underdeveloped periphery. This same process can also be found within nations between a domestic metropolis (a capital city, for example) and the surrounding satellite cities and regions.

Frank's theoretical perspective has been neatly summed up and critiqued by Ernesto Laclau (1971). The summary includes the following theses: First, development does not occur through a succession of stages, and today's developed countries were never underdeveloped, although they were once undeveloped. Second, underdevelopment is part of the historical product of relations between the underdeveloped satellites and the present developed metropolises. Third, the dualist interpretation must be rejected because capitalism has effectively and completely penetrated the undeveloped world. Fourth, metropolitan-satellite relations are found within countries as well as in the imperialist world order. Fifth, Frank hypothesizes that development of satellites is limited by their dependent status; satellites experience their greatest growth only when their links to the metropolis are weakened, say during depression or world war; the most underdeveloped regions are those which were closely linked to the metropolis; originally latifundia were capitalist enterprises responsive to the growing demand in the national and international market. These ideas emerged in his earlier works cited
above and were refined in a series of essays, reprinted as an anthology (Frank, 1969).

While the relationship of dependence and underdevelopment was implicit in Frank's earlier writings, explicit analysis of the relationship came later (for example, in 1970 and 1972b). During the interim his ideas were closely scrutinized by critics, especially on the left. Three such critics who are not mentioned by Frank in subsequent rejoinders to critics (1972a and 1972b), exemplify the dialogue that ensued. While subscribing to the basic theses and tenets of Frank's work, Petras argues for a clearer definition of such terms as underdevelopment and surplus. He calls for analysis of imperialism and class structure which direct the metropoles and satellites. Eugene Genovese asserts that "Frank's abilities as an historian, not to mention a logician, leave something to be desired: his evidence from the colonial period will not pass muster, is crudely interpreted, and does not prove a thing" (1970:325). He then goes on to argue the existence of a dual society. Stirton Weaver attempts to demonstrate how bourgeois economic theory might contribute to a class analysis, and he criticizes Frank for making only passing reference to class structure in his analysis of Chilean underdevelopment (Weaver, 1971).

Such criticism represents no more than a glimpse into the multi-faceted attacks on the Frank theses. Let us sum up the principal arguments. First, there is the view that underdevelopment must be understood in terms of classes, that the description of class structure seems overly schematic. Second, dependency is considered as purely an external relationship imposed on Latin America from abroad rather than as an internal integral element of Latin American society. Third, Frank's argument is static—it is necessary to demonstrate how the forms of dependency have changed in spite of its persistence. Fourth the term dependency lacks specific and well-defined content, and it must be operational. Frank acknowledges all these problems and attempts to resolve them in a later book in which he also retains the term bourgeois and adds "lumpen" to it (1970b:1-12). Despite this refinement, other critics continued to manifest new perspectives, prompting Frank to again respond. Frank's statement is included in the present number of Latin American Perspectives. In his reply to critics from the rightwing, traditional Marxist left, and new left, he refers to the inadequacies of the old and new dependency theories (1972a).

The development of underdevelopment thesis has influenced many interpretations of contemporary Latin America. Keith Griffin (1969), Franz Hinkelammert (1970a), and Rui Mauro Marini give us three contributions. Griffin attacks the notions of a dualistic model of growth. Next he refutes stage theories of development. Then he relies on the concept of underdevelopment, a product of history as he describes it—from the same process which produced development. His detailed and useful analysis embraces social and economic structure, resource transformation and foreign trade, capital imports, mixed enterprise and foreign investment, and inflation and exchange rate policy. Hinkelammert analyzes two dualities: that of traditional society and developed capitalist society; and that of underdeveloped society and developing society. His principal thesis states that "the world capitalist system as a system of international coordination of labor impedes a large number of countries from achieving an internal balance of labor. These countries we call underdeveloped" (p. 14). Marini analyzes underdevelopment as a consequence of capitalism and imperialism. He makes reference to the idea of subimperialism, illustrating this with the example of Brazil since 1964.
Finally, his analysis moves to alternative revolutionary strategies. In this latter respect, his discussion is unique, for unlike most interpretations mentioned above, that of Marini attempts to relate description of underdevelopment as a condition to action as a remedy.

Briefly, let us mention a number of essays which are influenced by and contribute to theories of underdevelopment in Latin America. Alschuler (1973) presents "a social theory of underdevelopment." He casts Latin America into a diffusionist perspective and jargonistically sets forth propositions for possible empirical inquiry. Cecena Cervantes (1970) focuses on superexploitation, dependence, and development; and he lists six types of dependency, describes each, and attributes dependency in general to backward capitalism which has produced underdevelopment. Florestán Fernandes (1970) believes that external domination over Latin America is due to the evolution of capitalism. Jorge Graciarena (1973) discusses the political alternatives available to Latin America as a consequence of capitalist development, the alternatives being semifascist authoritarianism or moderate reformism. Mauricio Lebedinsky (1968) examines the evolution from underdevelopment to development. Héctor Malavé Mata (1972) deals with unequal development and outside capitalization; the penetration of commercial dependency; and external domination and internal support. Michael Meeropol (1972) attempts a political economic analysis of underdevelopment. He echoes the theme of other essays by Weisskopf, MacEwan, and Weeks. Accordingly, the peripheral countries are locked into a state of limited economic development; this being the consequence of a booming export industry in the peripheral country which is controlled by foreign interests. Capitalism in the poor countries is likely to perpetuate underdevelopment because of increasing integration of the world capitalist system and because capitalism cannot promote sufficient economic growth for the entire population. Sergio de la Peña (1971) offers conceptualization and theory of development and underdevelopment. His historical interpretation of Latin American underdevelopment stresses the forces opposing development, especially in the post-1950 period. Sunkel and Paz (1970) focus on underdevelopment and suggest a theory of development.

The New Dependency. Much of the thrust of dependency theory emanates from the notion of the new dependency. Types of dependency are identifiable through periods of history, according to Dos Santos (1970e:232). Colonial dependency characterized the relations between Europeans and the colonies whereby a monopoly of trade complemented a monopoly of land, mines, and manpower in the colonized countries. Financial-industrial dependency consolidated itself at the end of the nineteenth century with, on the one hand, domination of capital in hegemonic centers and, on the other, investment of capital in the peripheral colonies for raw materials and agricultural products which in turn would be consumed by the centers. A new dependency based on investments by multinational corporations emerged after the Second World War. Dos Santos labels this a technological-industrial dependency. An elaboration of theory on the new dependency is found in several of his writings (especially Dos Santos, 1968; 1970c; 1970d). The thrust of his argument is directed against prevailing bourgeois assumptions about development in Latin America (1970a and 1970b); and it attempts to relate traditional notions of imperialism to the internal situation of the Latin American countries. Let us explore this latter concern.

The new dependency places limits on the development of Latin American economics. Industrial development is dependent on exports which generate
foreign currency to buy imported capital goods. Exports in turn are usually tied to traditional sectors of the economy which are controlled by oligarchies. Often the oligarchies are tied to foreign capital; and they remit their high profits abroad. Thus, it is not surprising that foreign capital controls the marketing of exported products, even though dependent countries have attempted to impose policies of exchange restrictions and taxes on foreign exports and have leaned toward the nationalization of production. Industrial development then is conditioned by fluctuations in the balance of payments which in dependent countries often leads to deficits caused by trade relations in a highly monopolized international market, the repatriation of foreign profits, and the need to rely on foreign capital and aid.

These conditions and relations of the new dependency have been related to the colonial heritage of Latin America by Stanley and Barbara Stein who affirm that “in backward, underdeveloped, or dependent areas of the globe, the heritage of the past has shaped and is shaping current widespread poverty” (1970:189). Elsewhere Stein has attempted to synthesize the economic historiography of Latin America, in particular citing works that derive insight from an analytical framework of structuralism and dependence (Stein and Hunt, 1971:231-248). Vasconi (1969 and 1970), Murga (1971) and Quijano (1970b) elaborate on new dependency theory, while Fausto (1971) reviews Dos Santos’ contributions in particular. Beyond these general contributions, the literature on the new dependency falls into several categories: financial dependency, external dependency, and cultural dependency are especially predominant. Let us briefly review each.

Concern with financial dependency is exemplified by Paz (1970) who explores in depth the consequences of denationalization of industry in the face of dependency on foreign finance. Maria del Rosario Green carries the analysis in a different direction. In one study (1971) she probes the repercussions of foreign aid and investment. In another study (1973) she critiques diffusionist developmental theory and turns to a model of dependency in an examination of U.S.-Latin American relations which she traces through historical periods.

External dependency is a related theme in the literature. In part, it derives from the ECLA concern with import substitution as a remedy to dependency. Celso Furtado has elaborated upon external dependency (1971) which he defines as “the structural situation in which a peripheral capitalism prevails in certain countries ...” It may exist in the absence of any direct foreign investment, and conceivably, even in the relations of a socialist country with capitalist countries commanding the flow of new products and processes of production ... Once the dependence has been created, the doors are open to the introduction of all the forms of economic exploitation which typify the relationships between underdeveloped and developed countries” (1974:4-5). French-Davis offers an “analysis of exchange policies in economies undergoing development” (1970:273) and concludes that neither a free nor a fixed policy would necessarily resolve the problem of external dependency. Osvaldo Sunkel (1967 and 1969) relates national developmental policy to external dependency while Marcos Kaplan (1968) delves into the political ramifications and Rui Mauro Marini (1972) examines exporting economies. Muller (1972) focuses on foreign technology and the economic dependence of subsistence countries while Carmona (1972) gives us a brief assessment of the impact of technology.

The cultural and ideological ramifications of dependency are dealt with by Juan Corradi (1971) in a comprehensive article. He critiques the diffusionist literature on development in Latin America and concerns himself, in particular,
with the culture and ideology adopted by local elites. He relates dependency to such ideologies as developmental nationalism and developmentalism. Quijano (1971) and Lalive d’Epinay (1971) focus on the question of cultural dependency somewhat along these lines, while Silva Michelena (1970) and Sunkel (1969 and 1970) look at cultural dependency in the university system, respectively in Venezuela and Chile. In another article Lalive d’Epinay (1972) goes a step further, relating dependency to populism, nationalism, and millenarianism.

**Dependency and Development.** The notion that capitalist development takes place within dependent situations has evolved primarily in the writings of Fernando Henrique Cardoso. Let us trace his line of argument (1972). Cardoso begins with the assumption that modern capitalism and imperialism differs from Lenin’s earlier conceptions. Capital accumulation, for example, is more the consequence of corporate rather than financial control. Investment by multinational corporations in Latin America is moving away from raw materials and agriculture to industry. More often than not these corporations comprise “local and state capital, private national capital, and monopoly international investment (but in the last analysis under foreign control)” (Cardoso, 1973b:11). Thus monopoly capitalism and development are not contradictory terms; and dependent capitalist development has become a new form of monopolistic expansion in the Third World. This development is oriented to a restricted, limited, and upper class-oriented type of market and society. At the same time, the amount of net foreign capital in dependent economies is decreasing. New foreign capital is not needed in some areas where there are local savings and reinvestment of profits in local markets; further, dependent economies during times of monopolistic imperialistic expansion are exporting capital to the dominant economies.

This analysis leads Cardoso to a critique of other dependentistas. First, analysis “based on the naive assumption that imperialism unifies the interests and reactions of dominated nations is a clear oversimplification of what is really occurring” (Cardoso, 1972:94). Second, the notion of development of underdevelopment and the assumption of a lack of dynamism in dependent economies because of imperialism are misleading (Cardoso, 1972:94). On the one hand, new trends in international capitalism have resulted in increased interdependence in production activities at the international level and in a modification in the patterns of dependence that limit developmental policy in the peripheral countries of the international capitalist system (Cardoso, 1973a:146). On the other hand, international capitalism has gained disproportional influence in industry. Whether or not industrial firms are owned by foreigners or nationals, in either case “they are linked to market investment, and decision-making structures located outside the dependent country” (Cardoso, 1973a:146).

Cardoso’s recent contributions to dependency theory draw heavily upon information in his earlier empirical investigation of entrepreneurs in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile (Cardoso, 1971a). He advances our understanding of dependency and power in Latin America (see especially Cardoso, 1972-1973; Garcia, 1971 and Faria, 1971 also would relate). Useful theoretical perspectives of dependency and development are stated elsewhere (Cardoso, 1968, 1971b; Cardoso and Faletto, 1969).

Cardoso’s ideas have influenced others such as Pompermayer (1973) who is beginning his study and Schmitter (1971 and 1972) who is skeptical about “normatively charged theorizing which credits dependency with causing virtually all of Latin America’s ills” but who finds “probabilistic” empirical support for some
assertions about dependency. In his critique of Cardoso and others, O'Brien (1973) suggests that the stress on development relates to a strong emphasis in the dependency literature on national development and he asks "If dependency is really more than a new form of nationalism wrapped up in sophisticated language."

Dependency and Imperialism. As mentioned above, Lenin related imperialism to dependency. A recent synthesis elaborates on this relationship. According to Benjamin Cohen (1973:15), imperialism refers to "any relationship of effective domination or control, political or economic, direct or indirect, of one nation over another..." This relationship involves dominance and dependence among nations which are large and small, rich and poor. Three principal forms of imperialism are evident through history. First, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries European mercantilism characterized the "old imperialism." Second, the European empire building of 1870 and thereafter represented a shift from informal to formal mechanisms of control and influence in the colonies during a period known as the "new imperialism" (see Fieldhouse, 1961, for a useful review of ideas on the literature on the old and new imperialisms). Third, the breakup of empires was accomplished by analysis of neo-colonialism and what today might be called "modern imperialism." Analytically, the theory of modern imperialism moves in two directions. One emphasizes the view from the metropolis and argues that imperialism is necessary for the advancement of capitalist economies. The other stresses the view from the periphery and focuses on the detrimental consequences of capitalist trade and investment in the poorer economies of the world.

Both these theoretical directions incorporate analysis of dependency, although the view from the periphery has provoked a variety of perspectives; some being non-Marxist and others Marxist. Some of these perspectives have attempted to relate imperialism to dependency, while others have refuted dependency altogether in favor of an interpretation based solely on imperialism. Recent events in the Middle East and the Arab oil embargo have prompted speculation about U.S. dependency on such raw materials as petroleum. While Henry Kissinger places policy emphasis on building an "interdependence" among nations, the U.S. press talks of the need for self-sufficiency and freedom from the Arab oil barons. Other views have begun to reflect on the question of dependency between the Soviet Union and other socialist nations. Let us turn to all these considerations in our assessment of the literature on dependency and imperialism.

Among the many recent efforts to relate dependency and imperialism to the Latin American experience are writings by Hinkelammert (1970b), Quijano (1972), and essays in the reader by Rhodes (1970). While Hinkelammert examines classical imperialism and underdevelopment, Quijano attempts to relate imperialist domination to the class struggle. Esteban (1961) analyzes imperialism and capitalist development within the context of dependency in his case study of Argentina. Bodenheimer (1970) distinguishes between non-Marxist and Marxist interpretations of imperialism in moving toward her position that a Marxist theory of imperialism can complement a theory of dependency.

While theories of imperialism assume an inequality between nations, some nations dominate over dependent nations which erodes autonomy and perpetuates exploitation. Non-Marxist theories differ from Marxist theories of imperialism on two levels. First, non-Marxist theory tends to associate imperialism with expansionism, thereby obscuring the subtle mechanisms through which imperialism has been internalized. Second, non-Marxist theory addresses itself to political and military explanations rather than to economic explanations in a
context of capitalist global expansion. These differences are evident in the literature.

Recent writings exemplify non-Marxist theories of imperialism. Non-Marxist conceptualization is offered by Lichtheim (1970); Miller, Bennett, and Alapatt (1970); and Pachter (1970). Recognizing that the role of multinational firms in Latin America approximates that described by the dependentists, Moore (1973) emphasizes the policies of Latin American countries which forge "a role of greater autonomy with the international system." He acknowledges the increased willingness of Latin American governments to break relationships with foreign investors; to create indigenous multinational enterprises; and to increase local input into decision-making of these enterprises. Galtung's (1971) contribution also relates to Latin America. He defines imperialism in terms of dominance and dependence. Center nations have power over peripheral nations, with power based on interest interrelationships. Three phases (colonial, neo-colonialist, and neo-neo-colonialist) and five types (economic, political, military, communication, and cultural) of imperialism are explored. His schematic, sometimes jargonistic, presentation seems to have stimulated German political scientists to delve into the relationship of imperialism to dependency. Gantzel (1973) synthesizes their work by identifying types of dominance in: relations between capitalist nations; relations between capitalist center nations and the periphery; relations between capitalist and socialist centers; and relations between socialist societies. As to the latter, he asserts that there is no real external dominance since "there is hardly any evidence that the extensive armament and economic aid from the socialist centers . . . has brought about such intensive penetration." As such he counters the argument that dependency is indeed a reality among socialist states, a position advocated by Ray (1973) and illustrated in the case of Cuba by Gouré and Weinkle (1972).

Non-Marxist theories of imperialism have not carried much weight in Latin America, which probably accounts for a dearth of such material. Marxist theories of imperialism, however, have generated considerable impact, especially in Latin American intellectual circles. Two principal lines of thinking have emerged in recent years. One, initiated by Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy (1966), serves as a modern substitute for the traditional Leninist approach to an analysis of monopoly capitalism. The other line, offered by Harry Magdoff (1969), traces imperialism from its beginnings to the modern period and attempts to relate the imperialist behavior of private enterprise to U.S. foreign policy. The two lines begin with different concerns but converge in their analysis of the large multinational corporations of modern capitalism and their home governments.

The stress of these writers on the thesis that corporate capital has replaced finance capital as the dominant form of capital has not been without dissent from economists who argue from a classic Leninist position. Such dissent is found in a series of articles by Robert Fitch and Mary Oppenheimer (1970) and James Becker (1971), while a useful synthesis of the split is in James O'Connor (1968 and 1971). The concern with large corporations, however, has stimulated a plethora of studies (from neo-classical to radical Marxist) on the multinational corporation (a bibliography is in Ajami and Osterberg, 1972).

The attempt to relate a theory of imperialism to dependency in Latin America is represented by advocates as well as dissenters. Let us identify examples on both sides. Caputo and Pizarro have presented the most exhaustive effort at linking theories of imperialism and dependency (1971b); they have applied their theory to the case of Chile (1970 and 1971a). Cardoso (1972 and 1973b) also relates
theories of imperialism and dependency in working toward his thesis that development and monopoly penetration in the industrial sectors of dependent economies are not incompatible. Dissenters to this approach include Warren (1973) and Weffort (1971).

CASE STUDIES AND ATTEMPTS TO APPLY DEPENDENCY THEORY

There has been little effort empirically to verify the assumptions of dependency theory. Tyler and Wogart (1973) undertake a modest test along lines of an international comparison. They inquire into Sunkel’s “general notion of the relationship between increasing international integration of less-developed countries and their national disintegration” and conclude that “there is not sufficient evidence to reject the dependency hypothesis” (p. 42). While rejecting “the normatively charged theorizing which credits dependencia with causing virtually all of Latin America’s ills” Schmitter (1974:99), feels that “the basis for a more subtle, differentiated, and empirically testable theory have been laid” (p. 100) and in an exploratory manner he has attempted to measure external dependence and its impact on political outcomes (Schmitter, 1971).

Case studies supported with new information and descriptive analysis are more prevalent, however. In this writer’s opinion, Quijano’s (1971) class analysis of Peruvian society is the most sophisticated, yet not definitive, effort to link class structure and actions to the outside world. Bagú’s study of Argentina (1949) and Prado’s of Brazil (1969) are examples of historical treatment which deal with class relations, explanations of underdevelopment, analysis of ties to the outside world and their consequences; both were written well before the availability of the current dependency studies.

Let us briefly review other case studies of dependency. Alfonso (1971) focuses on petroleum in an analysis of dependency in Venezuela. Hein and Stenzel (1973) suggest the basis for a more exhaustive study, illustrating with the same country. Bertero (1972) examines the pharmaceutical industry as a case of dependency in Brazil. Bonaparte (1971) assesses the thesis of development of underdevelopment in the poor Argentine province of Estero. Camacho (1972) directs attention to cultural domination in the underdevelopment of Costa Rica, while López Segura (1972) provides considerable detail of dependent capitalism and underdevelopment in Cuba before 1959. Two important studies of Chile have noted the importance of material and ideological dependence upon communications (Mattelart, 1970; and Mattelart, Castillo and Castillo, 1970). Meyer (1972) examines the impact of foreign aid and affirms that dependency has persisted in Mexico since the sixteenth century. Petras (1973) combines interesting essays on dependency in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. Torres Rivas (1969a, 1969b, and 1970) exemplifies his discussion of dependency with reference to Central America.

The relevancy of dependency theory is apparent in studies of other areas outside Latin America. Samir Amin (1972) writes about underdevelopment and dependency in Africa. He studies “how the dialect reveals itself between the major colonial policies and the structures inherited from the past” (1972b:505). Completed forms of dependence, he argues, appeared when Africa was made the periphery of the world capitalist system in an imperialist stage. William Minter (1971?) examines the impact of dependency in Angola. Certainly the most exhaustive account is provided by Walter Rodney (1972) who offers conceptualizations of development and underdevelopment, then relates them to his thesis.
that European colonialism led to the underdevelopment of Africa. Finally, Esseks (1971) relates economic dependence to political development in Africa while Barbara Stallings (1972) ties Africa to Latin America, basing her analysis essentially on the contributions of Latin American writers. These writers and their ideas provoked Samir Amin (1974) to critique the theory of underdevelopment. He notes that economic growth is an uneven process, analyzes the inequality of international specialization, and assesses the consequences of the international flow of capital for the center and the periphery. The concern with underdevelopment also extends to Asia, Gunnar Myrdal’s work serving as an example. Rudebeck (1969) critiques that work on the grounds that it provides a framework for analysis of internal aspects relating to underdevelopment but that it ignores external aspects, especially as related to dependency and international capitalism.

SOME ASSUMPTIONS AND ISSUES

Our discussion has alluded to many deep issues which have influenced the various theoretical directions in the dependency literature. Let us illustrate with two examples. First, is the attention given to definitions and interpretations of feudalism and dualism. This issue is raised by Fernández and Ocampo in the present number. Gunder Frank attacks the application of these terms to the real Latin America of today. His controversial position has been extensively debated. The curious reader might want to explore the following sources for further details: Beckford (1972); Cole and Sanders (1972); Laclau (1969, 1971); Novack, (1970); Rweyemamu, (1971); Seligson (1972); and Singer (1970). Second, there has been attention to the notion of uneven development, also a widely debated topic in the literature. The reader might initiate inquiry in this area by consulting Bluestone (1972) and Hinkelammert (1970c).

In summary, we can suggest several assumptions which most proponents of dependency theory support, even though their work may not yet have proven their validity. We draw these assumptions from the literature in the hope that they might guide the reader to further understanding, constructive critique, and refinement of dependency theory. First, it is generally believed that dependency theory provides a framework for explanations of underdevelopment and development. Second, dependency theory offers a foundation for analysis of class struggle and strategies to promote class struggle in the interest of resolving societal contradictions and problems. Finally, an understanding of dependency and the adoption of certain strategies to break dependency leads to the restructuring of societies, a restructuring which limits capitalism and promotes socialism in the seeking of a new and better society.
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