



Este artigo está licenciado sob forma de uma licença Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional, que permite uso irrestrito, distribuição e reprodução em qualquer meio, desde que a publicação original seja corretamente citada. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.pt_BR

DOI: 10.15448/1677-9509.2017.1.27810

The Currency of Ruy Mauro Marini's Thinking and Dependency Theory

La Vigencia del Pensamiento de Ruy Mauro Marini y la Teoría de la Dependencia

ADRIÁN SOTELO VALENCIA*



ABSTRACT – Ruy Mauro Marini's thinking, within the framework of Marxism, continues to apply in the 21st century because the conditions he discovered around the dialectics of dependency (super-exploitation of labor, unequal exchange, sub-imperialism, and the Fourth Power) remain in the contours of the world capitalist economy.

Keywords – Marini. Super-exploitation. Dependency.

RESUMEN – El pensamiento de Ruy Mauro Marini, en el marco del marxismo, sigue siendo vigente en el siglo XXI a causa de que las condiciones que el descubrió en torno a la dialéctica de la dependencia (superexplotación del trabajo, intercambio desigual, subimperialismo y Estado del Cuarto poder) se mantienen en el contorno de la economía capitalista mundial.

Palabras-clave – Marini. Superexplotación. Dependencia.

* Sociologist, researcher of the Center for Latin American Studies (CELA) of the FCPyS of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico City, México. *E-mail:* adriansotelo@politicas.unam.mx.
Submitted in: April/2017. *Approved in:* May/2017.

There are men who struggle for one day, and they are good. There are men who struggle for a year, and they are better. There are men who struggle many years, and they are better still. But there are those who struggle all their lives: These are the indispensable ones! (BERTOLT BRECHT).

Ruy Mauro Marini was a professor in the Sociology undergraduate program in the School of Political and Social Sciences of the National Autonomous University of Mexico. At that time, he had spent – with some interruptions – several years in exile from his country, Brazil, at the root of the military coup of 1964 that overthrew then constitutional president, João Belchior Marques Goulart and, at the same time, inaugurated the historical, political cycle of military dictatorships (1964-1985) that would extend practically to the mid-1980s. He was professor of the discipline: *Economic and Social World History*, in which he always showed a high and profound academic level and scholarly knowledge of the topic. However, what was most surprising was his profound knowledge of Latin American history and, in particular, Brazilian history, which, unlike others, he situated in abstract and concrete dimensions that permitted understanding it within a global and dynamic context that he came to characterize as *sub-imperialist*. We can say the same regarding other subjects he taught, not only in the School of Political and Social Sciences, but also in other institutions of higher education and postgraduate studies in and out of the country. In the School of Economics of UNAM, he was co-founder, professor, and researcher of the Division of Postgraduate Studies and became a Full-Time Full Professor with the highest category and level. Respected by friends and enemies, Marini always showed honesty and rigor in theoretical analysis of social phenomena. The imprint that he left in Mexico is uneraseable in a little over the 20 years he stayed, the greater part of which he spent in this country.

As an educator of important Mexican intellectuals and generations of youth who were guided and stimulated by him, Marini heads that privileged list of Marxist and humanist critics who are indispensable to illuminating radical social change and humanity's development in an indisputable horizon of overcoming capitalism as an economic system and social education, and not only in one of its facets, as neoliberalism and neo-developmentism can be.

Marini was dynamic, sensitive, and attentive to the development of contemporary occurrences. He always had on hand the concept, category, or hypothesis to creatively and rigorously quote them with the rebellious reality whose comprehension he insisted on unraveling, along with showing an enormous capacity to draw the processes and tendencies of contemporary phenomena. He never imposed his points of view; he was respectful and sensitive to what others thought. That is why he liked to listen and, then, expose his thoughts and, of course, defend them with solid arguments and clear ideas that were generally convincing and proposals. When he lectured before multitudes of students; when he exposed his masterful ideas in university auditoriums and debated with property in various forums and events in which in life he was very active – academic seminars, conferences, round tables, and, of course, in his writings – Marini never ran away from a discussion: he approached it with serenity and, unlike those who rejected their convictions, freely exposed and without subterfuge his affiliation to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and his inclination for a better world that, beyond capitalism, he saw needed to be fought for so as to embody democratic socialism in the world and in Our America. This was a conviction that followed him all his life, and he never renounced it.

An adamant Marxist, Ruy Mauro Marini is best known in university academic circles in Mexico and Latin America for his work *Dialéctica de la dependencia (The Dialectics of Dependency)*, which, before those who proclaim a supposed “crisis of paradigms” and of Latin American thinking of the 70s and 80s and to whom he always knew how to respond and refute with solid arguments, configures now as a classic work of required reading in the literature of contemporary Latin American thinking and social sciences in general, as the International Sociological Association confirms, which has classified it as among the most important works of twentieth century, alongside universal works like *One Dimensional Man* by Herbert

Marcuse; *Phenomenology of Perception* by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Marxist Theory of Alienation* by István Mészáros, *Political Power and Social Theory* by Barrington Moore; *Value in Social Theory* by Gunnar Myrdal, *Essai sur la qualification du travail* by Pierre Naville; *Structure and Process in Modern Societies* by Talcott Parsons, or *The Principles of Genetic Epistemology* by Jean Piaget.

Who does not know *Dialéctica*, does not know his work nor its author; but it should also be said that, today, to understand them, one must look at the whole of his writings distributed in newspapers, magazines, memoirs, books, and documents. The author of *Dialéctica* wrote works of capital importance, such as *Subdesarrollo y revolución (Underdevelopment and Revolution)*, *El reformismo y la contrarrevolución: estudios sobre Chile (Reformism and Counter-revolution: Studies on Chile)*, and his last book, written in Portuguese: Marini, Ruy Mauro, *América Latina: dependência e integração (Latin America: Dependence and Integration)*, Sao Paulo, Brasil Urgente, 1992, and published in Spanish by the Venezuelan publisher Nueva Sociedad. In addition to having coordinated a collective work under the title: *La Teoría Social Latinoamericana (Latin American Social Theory)* in four volumes published by Ediciones El Caballito between 1994 and 1996 and its pedagogical counterpart, *Textos Escogidos (Chosen Texts)*, published by the FCPyS, which indubitably are indispensable contributions to the education of Mexico's and Latin America's new generations of social scientists, becoming a work of required consultation.

Ruy Mauro Marini's work and thinking circulates through the classes and auditoriums of the most important universities of the world, Latin America, Mexico, and, now, Brazil, despite the labor of the right and some sectors from the left did to impede its dissemination in that country. One of the conditions of this circulation of ideas resides in the fact that Marini was a forger of university generations not only in Mexico, but in other countries of Latin America, like Chile, Argentina, and Central America. He always demonstrated patience and vocation in orienting students to channel their curiosities and assist their undergraduate and postgraduate theses in an atmosphere of friendship, dialogue, and serene discussion. He was capable of suggesting distinct theoretical and methodological routes, as well as bibliographies that would serve to support their research's development. Critical and rigorous analysis was always the core of his thinking.

Emergence of the TMD

More so than in strictly academic environments, dependency theory emerged in the political, ideological sphere of Brazil centered around the discussion of then-dominant paradigms in that moment in that country – and in Latin American – represented by the Communist Party of Brazil and CEPAL. This ideological, scientific, and political debate gave way to the formation of a party, in Brazil, where Marini participated, called *worker politics (POLOP)*, a worker party independent from the traditional parties and the farmers' leagues controlled by the PCB.

With respect to this, Marini says:

That brought me, still in France, to come into contact with the group that edited, in Brazil, the magazine *Movimento Socialista (Socialist Movement)*, the Socialist Party's youth organ (which published my article where I settled terms with national-developmentism), in particular with Eric Sachs, with whom I would come to establish, on my return, a great friendship and whose experience and political culture influenced me strongly. This group, with its main chapters in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, and Belo Horizonte, would constitute, later on, the Organización Revolucionaria Marxista-Política Obrera (Political Marxist Revolutionary Worker Organization) (POLOP, by its initials in Portuguese), the first expression in Brazil of the revolutionary left that emerged in all of Latin America.¹

It would give origin to a new conception that called itself the *revolutionary* left – differentiated from the reformist wing – which we would come to know in that way in later decades, especially in Chile, where they discuss and confront the main theses of endogenism, of CEPAL, and of authors partial to the “dependency approach.”

On the other hand, the notion of dependency, in the middle of the 60s (1964-1967) in the heat of the military State soup in Brazil, closed definitely the belief in an “autonomous national development” track of capitalism in Latin America that had been sustained by old theories of development and by CEPAL’s structuralist thinking. As recognized by Cardoso:

... criticism of ‘sociology of development’ and ‘criticism of functionalism’ appeared, with vigor, simultaneously with criticism of national populism and the political positions that corresponded to it. These are, as a whole, the intellectual political antecedents of analyses based on the perspective of dependency.²

In this way, as a concept, dependency was perceived by many Latin America scholars as a theoretical, conceptual, and methodological specificity to comprehend and analyze the periphery’s socioeconomic and political problems, in particular, those of Latin America and the Caribbean, as an underdeveloped and subordinated whole much as well as the expansion of world capital and imperialism.

In a work assigned to study the origin of the concept of dependency, its nature and meaning, Cardoso clarifies that:

...we have tried to analyze...the forms of articulation among dependent countries (classes, states, and economies) and imperialist countries. This is the field of a possible theory of dependency. This, as I have indicated in other works, is not an alternative to the theory of imperialism; it is a complement. As a complement to the theory of imperialism, dependency theory needs, certainly, that periodization of the world capitalist economy and characterization of the current stage of imperialism be revised continuously.³

It should be noted that in the well-known path run by Cardoso – which conducted him from reformist Weberianism to orthodox neoliberalism – who in the previous citation still accepted the idea of constructing dependency *theory*, evidently never completed this task of “updating” the theory of imperialism from dependency theory, which remained, better yet, was stationed in the Weberian arsenal and in the conservative version of “interdependence” theory which considered it, in sum, as a “category in transition.”⁴ However, his observation is pertinent with respect to the need that the concepts (abstract) should correspond more or less approximately to the historical, concrete situations of dependency and, thus, have the imperious need to redefine itself constantly as a function of periodization – and of the changes that arise in social, political, economic, and international orders – of capitalism’s development as a historical mode of production that naturally experiments with transformations from the cooperative and imperialist phase, through the Great Industry and its manufacturing state, to its current computer structural configuration and financialized economy governed by fictitious capital and fictitious profits.⁵

It is important to highlight the ideas relative to the origin and characteristics of dependency theory. Regarding the first, we should note that, according to Raúl Forner-Betancourt, under the influence of the Cuban revolution, from the mid 1960s, and in the contours of the *Alianza para el Progreso’s* (Alliance for Progress – ALPRO) failure, Latin American social science configures as the most important and vital space of transformation and theoretical impulse of Marxist analysis in Latin America. Within this process, continues the autor, it can be considered that “...the formulation of dependency theory (or dependency theories) as the true core of the development of that new Latin American social science, since it introduces a new paradigm for interpreting the subcontinent’s situation; and also, logically, for political action.”⁶

As for the second point, according to Marini, the dependency theory is *not born* as *Marxist* thinking. It *incorporates* Marxist instruments, so that the more it advances in its approaches, the more it needs Marxism until finally fully settling in the plan of Marxism. For this reason, the author insists that only Marxist theory could study, comprehend, and analyze dependency adequately, due to the structural, functionalist elements that adhered to its formation that had to be completely removed.⁷

This trajectory marked by Marini – the *Marxistization* of dependency theory – is the only one that can be considered serious, against wind and tide and in long-term historic perspective, in overcoming not only the neoliberal ideological universe (dominant today), through its systematic criticism, but also dependent capitalism in its neoliberal phase, while the dominant positions, such as neo-developmentism and post-modernism and its byproducts (postcolonialism and occidentalism) are concerned – implicitly and explicitly – for its reproduction through implementing structural reforms and alliances with the dominant classes and the State.

The second idea, relative to dependency's characteristics, consists of placing which theoretical, methodological level constitutes as theory, and the dependentist Marxist Vania Bambirra indicates to us:

Obviously not in the sense of a general theory of the mode of capitalist production, because that was done by Marx; also not of the 'mode of dependent capitalist production,' because this does not exist; but in the study of dependent economic, social capitalist formations, it is worth saying, analysis at a lower level of abstraction, capable of capturing the specific combination of the modes of production that have co-existed in Latin America under capitalism's hegemony.⁸

The last phrase relative to the "combination of the modes of production" is arguable, given if it is correct that in the past pre-capitalist structures of production existed. Nevertheless, capitalism developed in Latin America at an amplified scale from the expansion of the advanced centers of capitalism that one way or another subordinated the pre-capitalist formations and productive systems structurally constituting, in this way, the region's delays and underdevelopment.

As the Chilean Marxist and dependentist historian Luis Vitale lays out well:

... the mode of production of the Hispanoamerican colonies was not feudal. It also did not have the distinctive features of a modern and industrial capitalist nation. The origins of capitalism in the Colony were different from those of Europe. History does not flow in a straight line. Latin America did not follow the classic process of European capitalism, since it went directly from primitive communities to an insipient capitalism, basically a producer of precious metals and raw materials.⁹

Setting this topic aside, which we do not approach here, it is important to highlight the level, for lack of a better word, in which dependency theory is constructed with the theoretical, methodological weapons of Marxism and the theory of imperialism, as well as the very ones that aggregate the specificity of Latin American formations in the constitution processes of its societies and social classes; forms of production, life, and labor, as well as its territories and Nation-States; specificities that aggregate complex and diverse structural elements and configurations.

With these two exceptions, we can say that Marini's discourse dialectically articulates the notion of dependency with that of imperialism without breaking its unity:

For dependency theory, in the measure that one and the other are fruits of the development of world capitalism, imperialism is not something external to dependency. On the contrary, imperialism permeates all dependent economy and society, representing a constitutive factor in its socioeconomic structures, its States, its culture. Assuming this analysis perspective opens new perspectives to historical and sociological studies in Latin America.¹⁰

As can be appreciated in the previous citation, the autor is clear, in confronting the theses of the designated “orthodox Marxism” (in general, identified with the ideas and postulates of the Latin American Communist Parties), as well as CEPAL’s theses with respect to imperialism as a world system that is a constitutive part of the functioning of the cycle of capital and of the owners of capitalist reproduction of Latin America, and not at all something external that should be “isolated” in altars of a supposed “autonomous national development,” as was postulated by the aforementioned theoretical currents.

Marini’s affirmation constitutes the essence of the divergence and rupture with CEPAL’s theories and, including, other components of the same dependency theory as the self-proclaimed approach of reformist roots and, including, conservative and others, not exactly dependentists, like those of the “styles of development” or “structural dualism.”

Dependency Approach or Theory?

For a long time, there was thought to have been one sole dependency theory, and, obviously, it was identified with Cardoso and his current also known as the *Escola de São Paulo* (School of São Paulo) as its main representative. Among other alluded reasons, the forced exile of Marini and other Marxist authors that were elaborating it counts, due to the State coup in Brazil. They would have to spend more than two decades to resume their approaches and return to thinking about elaborating an authentic TMD that not only took into account the historic past of the Latin American countries, but also its present and future in the context of its dependent and subordinated insertion in the world capitalist market.

The 1970s is very important and rich in the creation of theoretical perspectives and developments in concordance with the conditions and changes that occurred in Latin American countries, as well as at the world level. In terms of context, the emergence and development of the cycle of Latin American military dictatorships occurred which, according to Marini, would give origin to the *States of counterinsurgency* in the region. On the other hand, articulated to the previous, the depletion and crisis of the owner of capitalist accumulation and reproduction that flourished in Latin America after World War II is verified, particularly, in the region’s largest countries from the point of view of their organic composition of capital, levels of urban, industrial development, and, including, their population and territory.¹¹ We refer mainly to Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico, where the State executed a central role in said process. Let us say that a series of economic perturbances that conduct first towards depletion and, later, towards the crisis of import substitution industrialization that CEPAL and other authors had proclaimed, including, dependentists, as the main “strategy of development.” These difficulties in the international context produce phenomena that do not do more than deepen this crisis of capitalist accumulation and is a crisis of structural order that will make an eclosion in the following decade, unlocking the phenomenon of neoliberalism.¹²

Both processes – counter-revolution and crisis of the owner of accumulation – will characterize the pivotal decades of the 60s and 70s until the arrival of the democratization process from the mid-80s and of the designated globalization in course of that decade onward facing the fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence and consolidation of the denominated *Washington Consensus*.¹³ From the point of view of the occurrences and their relation with the epistemological trajectories, a theoretical crisis of the dominant thinking in the region also corresponds to this crisis in the period hegemonized by CEPAL and the correlative emergence of dependency theory(ies): which I say in plural because, as we will see further on, in the end will express themselves in two components: that of *approach* and that of *Marxist*, with distinct epistemological and methodological frameworks, including: found, as well as to its diagnostics and conclusions.

In the case of CEPAL’s thinking and its main theorists, as we have seen, its nuclear, synthetic conception went into crisis, which, in my judgment, was never proven and was only a hypothetical, well-

intended postulate that the capitalist crisis of the 60s threw overboard: the *possibility*, under meeting certain conditions of economic, social, political, and administrative order that, countries like ours, dependent, underdeveloped, and behind, could develop an *autonomous capitalism* with a strong intervention of the State to protect economic, social planning.

This is what is appreciated in the texts and documents of the main theorists of CEPAL in authors such as Celso Furtado, *María da Conceição Tavares*, Aníbal Pinto, Juan Noyola, Aldo Ferrer, and Raúl Prebich, this last one being the first autor of a theoretical, methodological, and analytical elaboration of the theory of development from the heterodox structuralist point of view, and who postulated the famous *center-periphery theorem*¹⁴ which would conduct him, later on, to elaborate his own conception about *peripheral capitalism*¹⁵, and by his conduct, CEPAL aggregated new elements before the theory of international commerce based on the comparative advantages then in vogue; capture and construct the division, the conceptualization of the world economy, as a whole, with emphasis on the existence of a *center*, which is hegemonic and holds in its breast the dominant relations whose cycles of reproduction generate development and growth in a subordinated, dependent, backwards *periphery* that surrounds it. This is the most important contribution of CEPAL's theory of development to Latin American thinking through its structuralist theory of development – that Marini would confront – in which the thinking of Brazilian Celso Furtado¹⁶ frames itself and recurs certainly to Marx, but also to Keynes and other authors of this current, being one of the most radical and influential thinkers of this international organism that struggled to reduce concentration of income and social injustice through – predominantly – State intervention in the economy as organizer and defender of the collective interests of society.¹⁷ He did not fail to consider industrialization and said intervention with the keys of development (capitalist) in general and of the reduction of “external dependence.” Of course, socialism never figured as an alternative for economic, social development as formation and mode of production.

The nucleus of these conceptions reside in the belief in the “possibility” that dependent countries with an *organic composition* of capital *inferior* to that of developed countries of advanced capitalism such as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, or Chile: countries that do not maintain the profile of classes that developed societies such as England, the United States, or Germany possessed; countries with populations that, between the 1950s and 1960s, were thrown into rurality in percentages above 70%-80% of the total population and in development processes based on agriculture, livestock, or extractive activities, where there was less urbanization, “traditional society” prevailed over the “literate industrial society” based on agrarian or mining income before “fully developed” industrial societies¹⁸, could rely on the characteristics, mechanisms, and public policies implemented by the State to “adopt” an integrated development similar to the development, for example, of the United States: the society of masses based on the manufacturing and industrial consumption that is the diagram, the model, of US society (Weber's “ideal type” and Rostow's “stages of development”)¹⁹ and of its owner of capital accumulation and reproduction. This is what enters in crisis and, along with it, new perspectives emerge, such as that of the “dependency approach” and *dependency theory* of the Marxist-Marinist component in the middle of the 60s in Brazil as a distinct and radical theoretical, political alternative of conceptualizing the world and global and Latin American capitalism before the epistemological crisis of the theories in vogue represented by CEPAL, by the theses tied to the endogenism of the Latin American communist parties and to the functionalist theory of modernization and social change.

In this section, we take a moment to clarify that it is the “dependency approach” and its difference with those who advocate the construction of the same theory as in Marini's case. For much time, the academic community, social scientists, and even the means of communication identified dependency (such as school, approach, or theory) only with the dominant thinking that Carodoso's perspective represented and of a series of theorists connected to it, but that, with the passage of time gradually differed and forked into currents of thinking with respect to dependentism: the dominant one we have just mentioned and the one represented by Marini and other authors and researchers interested in going more in depth in the

topic of dependency to explain the world and Latin American phenomena in light of the construction, *ad hoc*, of a series of categories and concepts elaborated specifically for it. Thus, the existence of two denominated perspectives are elucidated, one as *approach* and, the other, as *theory*. The first was one way, or method, of approximation to the study of social reality, while the second erected *dependency* as such as an *object of study*.²⁰ The force of discussion and differentiation, these two components, from the political, ideological point of view, crystalized in the characterization of the first as nationalist-bougeoisie and reformist, while the other was branded as revolutionary and Marxist.²¹

For Sonntag – who decidedly inclines towards Cardoso and his *School's* perspective – there are serious differences between both forms of conceiving dependency: the first emphasizes the “approach’s” method, which is the “concrete analysis of concrete situations of dependency” and first emphasizes the study of classes and the system of domination. For its part, dependency theory – supposedly undervaluing these dimensions of social reality – conceives it as a category of structural order that *possesses* its own *theoretical status*, which converts it into an *object of study* and that – which results to be completely false and absurd – will end up “denying” the possibility of capitalism’s development in our countries.²² This last part is completely inconsistent with the main theses, developments, and postulates supported by the dependency theorists, particularly by Marini in the measure in which, besides conceiving the category of dependency in its historic, structural condition that possesses its own cycle of capital accumulation and reproduction that interlaces itself dialectically with the dynamic of social classes and their struggles, as well as with the State’s power, puts the accent, not on the “impossibility” of capitalist development in the designated periphery, but on the value transfers and surplus-value that it realices systematically towards the imperialist centers of hegemonic capitalism making use of, at the same time, the super-exploitation of the laborforce as mechanism that reimburses the loss of value and surplus-value that implies said transfer to the dependent countries’ dominant classes. Other authors, more connected to CEPAL, postulated a theory of economic stagnation of Latin America. For example, Celso Furtado infers a *tendency* to economic stagnation due, among other reasons, to “strangulation of growth” that provoke the propensity to concentration of technical progress in the most efficient and profitable productive units, like “accute concentration of income,” and concludes: “In the most general case, the decline in economic efficiency directly provokes economic stagnation”²³ and sentences further on: “In this sense, a structural character can be attributed to the problem of economic stagnation.”²⁴ Better yet, it is Cardoso’s school and his followers who cast aside the category of dependency to end up embracing the conservative and neoliberal theory of “interdependence.” And in this judgment, Marini was not mistaken since Cardoso conceives dependent economy as an “accidental success” of historical capitalism’s development and not as its “immanent condition.”²⁵

In the perspective of TMD – which is what interests us here – the historical and structural development of dependent capitalism does not appear as something “external” to the imperialist system (theories of the approach, of endogenism, and of CEPAL), as it is a part (subordinated) and constitutive of it. This last line of comprehension synthesizes the idea of TMD that, in its theoretical, methodological expression, captures the existence of five historical forms of dependency:

- a) *Traditional dependency* – or original – of colonial nature (1521-1850). Here, for example, highlights the Argentinian historian Sergio Bagú, who pertinently coined the concept *colonial capitalism* against the theses that postulated the existence of feudalism in Latin American societies²⁶ and the theories of articulation of the modes of production. We should also mention the monumental work of the Chilean historian Luis Vitale who, against the feudalist theories that “medievalized” Spanish colonial society, argues for the thesis of early development of capitalism in our countries.²⁷
- b) *Commercial-exporter dependency* in the context of the oligarchic, landowner system (1850-1930).

- c) *Financial, industrial dependency* (1930-1950).
- d) Subsequently, the depletion of import substitution and the new affluence of direct foreign investment and its re-orientation towards industry, imprinted them with a “new carácter” to dependency characterized by the predominance of the technological-industrial binomial (1950-1975) and the imperialist integration of productive systems.
- e) The current stage is characterized by financial-technological neoliberal dependency under the predominance of fictitious, speculative capital that projects itself towards financial and computer services; towards the world market as the core of accumulation and realization of profits; the constitution of new peripheries as product of the international division of labor and its specialization in producing natural resources, food, and minerals; exportation of cheap labor from dependent countries to developed countries (Spain, United States, France, England).
- f) This modern structure of dependency does not mean that the capital's cycles, particularly the productive and mercantile, do not have their own dynamic, but it is the fictitious capital and the weight of technology that subordinate them and are imprinting their dynamic.

This phase of capitalist restructuring and de-industrialization at a world scale allows to place the structural transformations in course, social and political, which affect the dimensions of contemporary societies, in particular, the quantitative and qualitative modifications of the world of labor, in both developed countries and in dependent and underdeveloped countries. Besides the consideration that every structural and material change or transformation that occurs in society and in its culmination of social and political relations necessarily, sooner or later, somehow affect social thinking and its diverse theoretical expressions and currents that constitute them historically in their methods, as in their concepts and categories of analysis.

Currency of Marini's Thinking and Neoliberalism

Latin American did not stay at the margin of the ideological and political rush of neoliberalism throughout the course of the 1980s and 1990s. In fact, it was the laboratory of its confection and “empirical proof” of its “efficacy,” in particular in Chile.²⁸ Diverse theoretical currents were marginalized and displaced from the discourse of the social sciences and academic and research institutions, among which can be found the very critical Marxist components of dependency that drove Marini and other connoted intellectuals. Still, other currents that were not Marxist but with certain critical content of the system, such as neo-developmentism and edogenism rooted within the tradition of the Latin American communist parties, also were displaced and, in this way, functionalism and diverse approaches of the neoclassical economic theory rearticulated in an eclectic mold whose mark was, and still is, to turn over capitalist economies and societies to the imperatives of the market and the interests of private companies with minimum State interference in regulating the economy and property of the public companies that are privatized. Mexico, formerly neoliberal of PRI-PAN; currently Brazil of the coupist Temer and the duo PMDB-PSDB; and Argentina of the philo-neoliberal businessman Macri are related examples.

Marxist dependency theory, by the conduct of Marini and other authors like André Gunder Frank and Vania Bambirra, faced the neoliberal rush by unifying dialectics and Marx's theory in a global vision that bared the profound contradictions of the operation of the capitalist mode of production in dependent and underdeveloped countries that the “neoclassical models” and functionalist models intended to occult through constructing a-historic “models” and complicated mathematized formulations of the region's economic and social reality.

The overwhelming criticisms against dependency theory that have been generalized during the 80s and 90s supplied an effect contrary to resuming its critical role and came out fortified from the profound crisis that Latin American capitalism experimented during the designated “lost decade.” Those were mistaken who since the delapidated ideological caves of eclecticism and revisionism “predicted” the death of *Marxist dependency theory*. On the contrary, today this thought is alive because, as Marini wrote in his *Memoria* (Memoir) “...to retake the thread of dependency theory as the springboard, means to reencounter the best of the left’s thinking...”, even though, certainly, as the very Marini warns, it does not mean to give one absolute answer to the current Latin American and world problematic. This last though, in its moment, is a general task of Latin American critical and Marxist thinking as a whole and not individual work, as it is believed, by some “enlightened intellectuals.”

Because of this, Marini always defended the thesis that dependency theory was not a finished theory, as many critics sustained mistakenly, but a *sketch* and a *project* that was, and is, necessary to develop. That is why we can consider that Marini forged the cement blocks to construct a critical thinking and theory that would account for, for the first time, the nature of dependent capitalism of our times without the interference of the dominant theories of Euro-North American origin. In the final part of his *Memoria*, for example, Marini lays down that: “It is fit to conclude insisting on a peculiar detail of dependency theory, whatever may be the judgment: its decisive contribution to slowing down the study of Latin America by Latin Americans and its capacity to, investing for the first time the sense of the relations among the region and the great capitalist centers, make, instead of a receptor, Latin American thinking become an influence over the progressive currents of Europe and the United States.”²⁹ A task more urgent than ever in the course of this twenty-first century in universities, institutions, and centers of higher education and postgraduate studies is in the measure in which the ideology of the self-designated “unique” neoliberal thinking intends to erect the Totem Pole of human thinking to subordinate and orient it towards the imperatives of capitalism and imperialism. Luckily, in life Marini wrote his intellectual autobiography, which runs throughout his life until 1990, where the reader can appreciate the genesis of his thinking, as well as the political and individual trajectory of the author and a detailed relation of his published and unpublished works.³⁰

Memoria, in fact, is already a valuable document for reconstructing an important stage of the Latin American revolutionary left, particularly, of those countries that took him in during his exile: Mexico and Chile. In it, we apprehend how Marxist education and the use of dialectics and constructive criticism led Marini to bare the conservative and bourgeoisie essence of theories of development, fundamentally North American in origin; of developmentist and neo-developmentist currents that flourished in the continent, as well as the criticism to endogenism and neoliberalism which is currently determining the gears of our economies and societies, leading them to disaster.³¹

Unlike many authors, Marini breaks with and adjusts affairs with CEPAL’s developmentist ideology and with the communist parties of his time, and clarifies the true origin of dependency theory: He says “...opposing current interpretations that see it – dependency theory, ASV – as a byproduct and academic alternative to CEPAL’s developmentist theory, dependency theory has its roots in the conceptions that the new left elaborated, particularly in Brazil, even though its political development was greater in Cuba, Venezuela, and Peru for facing the ideology of the communist parties.”³²

From here, dependency theory would walk by its own means looking to find its categories and concepts in the region’s complex reality. And this task began with the innovation of original concepts such as *super-exploitation of work* – which is the core of Marini’s thinking; *unequal exchange*³³, *State of counter-insurgency* and *sub-imperialism*, *integrated bourgeoisie*, *the Fourth power*, *antagonistic cooperation*, among others. Without forgetting his important contributions, in distinct moments of his life, to the development of the theory of democracy and of socialism. In some way, these theoretical concepts constitute the architecture of dependency theory in Marini’s thinking, elaborated as a methodological and theoretical instrument of live and anti-dogmatic Marxism. Applied to the study of the historical, social

economies and formations of Latin America, including other dependent and underdeveloped countries of the world economy, these analytical concepts allowed to understand the occult and contradictory dynamic that explains, in last instance, why said countries in the twenty-first century have been and continue to be – as shown in the crises in course in countries such as Brazil and Argentina, not to mention the rest of Latin America – completely incapable structurally to overcome conditions of dependency, underdevelopment, and delay that in this dawn of the twenty-first century, since the 80s, far from eradicating itself, are going deeper than ever into recent history, reaffirming, in this way, the operation of the general laws of capitalism in Latin American social formations inserted in the world market, in the international division of hegemonized labor by advanced capitalist countries, and in the average rate of profits' tendency to the fall that is the fundamental law of the capital system.³⁴

In an article titled “Subdesarrollo y revolución en América Latina” (“Underdevelopment and Revolution in Latin America”), written in 1967, Marini projects what will be one of his central theses; he says: “This essay, which reflects the essence of the research that I have been doing, since the end of 1965, resumes its content in the initial declaration: ‘*the history of Latin American underdevelopment is the history of the world capitalist system's development,*’ and he dedicates himself to demonstrating that this underdevelopment is simply the particular form that the region assumed in integrating itself to world capitalism.”³⁵

An exemplar thesis that maintains its currency in the measure that, in postulating that the contemporary underdevelopment problems in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, are essentially a product of the unusual development of industrialized capitalism of the twentieth century, does no more than bare the contradictory reality that presents itself to us every day in our economic, social, political, cultural lives, and in our salaries and life and work conditions. However, at a more general and macroeconomic level, the monstrous external debt of the underdeveloped economies have to be denounced to illustrate an efficient, modern mechanism and of a financial cut that “underdevelops” our countries, at the same time that it contributes to amplifying the process of capital concentration and centralization in developed centers as had never been seen before.

This thesis, which in its moment was fought by Tyrians and Trojans, deep down explains the world economy's current restructuring throughout the course of the 80s and the configuration of new hegemonic protagonists in the world, such as Japan, Germany, and the United States, reserving, as Marini said, the hard strips of the top productive and technological process, while external debt is provoked in dependent countries – with the value transfers that this process implies – as well as the growing process of de-industrialization that said economies have been experimenting in the last years in all of Latin America, but notably in those that develop more, like Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile.

In this sense, *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (*The Dialectics of Dependency*) is an undeniably original text, that opens new paths in Marxist studies in the region and places the study of the Latin American reality over other bases:

Instead of following this reasoning and being faithful to my principle that underdevelopment is the other face of development, I analyzed in what conditions Latin America had integrated itself to the world market and how that integration: a) functioned for the world capitalist economy and b) altered the Latin American economy. The exporting economy, that emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century in pioneering countries (Chile and Brazil), generalizing afterwards, it seemed, in this perspective, as the process and the result of a transition to capitalism and how the way it assumes that capitalism, in the framework of a determined international division of labor. Once accepted, the value transfers that emerged from there could not be seen as an anomaly or an obstacle, but first as the consequence of the world market's own legality and as an incentive to the development of Latin American capitalist production, based on two premises:

abundance of natural resources and super-exploitation of labor (which presupposed abundance of labor). The first premise resulted in monoproduction; the second, underdeveloped economies' own indicators. The industrialization subsequently operated would be determined by the internal and external relations of production, constituted over the base of these premises. Once the fundamental question was resolved, to my understanding, that is, the way capitalism affected the essence of Latin American economy, the formation of surplus-value, I became preoccupied with the transformation of this into profit and with the specificities that that metamorphosis closed. Some indications, referent to the point where my research arrived are contained in the text and in other works written in that time, but I would only resolve the problema some years afterward, in Mexico.³⁶

And, effectively, he approached them in subsequent writings where he would discover and refine the causes of the Latin American economy's recurrent crises. Marini says:

In relation to the theoretical questions placed by *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (The Dialectics of Dependency), I took them up again, in this third exile, in three levels: the cycle of capital in the dependent economy, the transformation of surplus-value into profit, and sub-imperialism. In what refers to the capital's cycle, the investigation parted from the circulation-production-circulation relation, applying it, first, to the changes in the Brazilian economy, from the first oil clash; object of intervention in the II National Conference of Economists of Mexico, in 1977, which is registered in the event's Minutes, the text evolved into the essay 'Estado y crisis en Brasil' ('State and Crisis in Brazil'), published by *Cuadernos Políticos*. And, soon after, in the plan of the general theory, I analyzed, in light of this relation, the dependent economy's movement in the context of the capital-money cycle; this was the topic of the conference pronounced in a seminar over the agrarian issue and its relation with the market, whose text was included in *Mercado y dependencia* (Market and Dependency), a reading published in 1979.³⁷

In 1980, the Mexican magazine *Cuadernos Políticos*, published the work: "Plusvalía extraordinaria y acumulación de capital" (Extraordinary Surplus-Value and Capital Accumulation), (dissertation essay opposing the open contest for full profesor of the School of Economics of UNAM),

... divided in three sections. In the first, I expose the diagrams of reproduction and, entering the controversy that aroused in different moments of the history of Marxism, look to show the specific purpose they meet in the theoretical construction of Marx: of the necessary compatibility of the magnitudes of value produced in the economy's distinct departments, and I analyze the three premises that so much discussion caused: a) the exclusion of the world market, b) the existence of only two classes, and c) the consideration of the degree of exploitation of labor as a constant factor. In the second, I part from the variation of this last factor, examining the effects of the changes in the work day, in the intensity, and in the productivity over the relation of the value of use-value and over distribution. In the third section, I verify the use of the diagrams by three authors: Maria da Conceição Tavares, s/d., Francisco de Oliveira and Mazzuchelli, 1977, and Gilberto Mathias, 1977, showing that the first, besides not breaking, in fact, with the traditional cepaline diagram (agriculture-industry-State), confuses the value of use and value; the second authors, acutely capturing the world national-money coin contradiction, end up only noticing the circulation's movement; and the third, who provides us with a brilliant analysis of the State's role in determining the rate of profit, forgets to consider the profit-surplus-value relation (we resume this discussion in Mexico, in that year, occasion in which Mathias admitted to having been mistaken in the criticism he made of me in his

work, with respect to super-exploitation of labor). This essay, probably, the least known of my writings, is an indispensable complement to *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (*The Dialectics of Dependency*), in the measure in which the result of the investigations I began in Chile express, over the effect of super-exploitation of labor and fixation of extraordinary surplus-value.³⁸

I have included this extensive citation to show how there was a logical and dialectic articulation in Marini's writings, always as a function of the fundamental notions that originally developed in *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (*The Dialectics of Dependency*) and that nothing, definitively, had to do with, as the detractors of Marxist thinking of dependency mistakenly affirmed, with the currents of structural dualism or with the theory of modernization of functionalist turn over centered on the transit of traditional societies to modern and industrial ones.³⁹ *This overlapping, seems to me, should constitute a governing core to continue with the development of his thinking and of his theory in the general framework of development of Marxism in the twenty-first century as the only doctrine and critical methodology to capitalism in all of its modalities.*

In second place, Marini's method, which parts from the world market to then, attend to the internal problems of the dependent countries' specific means of production – a method that always confronted the endogenist theses – should be resumed in light of the recent changes of the capitalist economy that, such as and how Marini had envisioned, today project themselves as a true global economy capable of articulating national economies even more around the “comercial blocs” that overdetermine them. In the case of the dependent economies, this new process of worldization has not led to an “autonomous development” (as CEPAL'S “center/periphery” theorem suggested) that guarantees its continuity in terms of reaching more complex and mature stages of the industrialization process. On the contrary, as to what is being witnessed is, in a certain way, the resurrection of the “old” exporting economy of the nineteenth century, but over “modern bases,” for example, centered on the speculative financial system, in the importation of computer and microelectronic technology, but in exchange of sacrificing the “endogenous processes of development” of the industry and the internal markets, particularly those designated towards popular consumption. Marini exposes this idea, for example, in his book: *América Latina: dependência e integração* (*Latin America: Dependency and Integration*). And, from this book, all of its material consequences of development and economic growth and of more concrete problemas must be taken as its effects on employment, the salary, and on the labor force's qualification that, as a byproduct of this process of global capitalist restructuring, becomes more dangerous every time it configures an extension process of the super-exploitation of labor in practically all of the world that demands, by general rule, radical changes of the political, industrial order of labor relations and, in general, of the world of labor to adjust them to the processes of production and valuation of capital.⁴⁰ With respect to this, one can observe what occurs in Greece in light of the imposition of extreme austerity programs by the part of the Troika in Europe and their corresponding policies in Latin American that are re-editing themselves in light of the current economic crisis to confirm what we are saying.

I consider it necessary to follow the imprint of these theoretical, methodological premises and of the investigation of contemporary Latin American dependent social capitalist formation at the level that Marini places it to develop TMD. With respect to that, in an interview, the author says: “...dependency theory is *not born* as Marxist thinking, it *incorporates* Marxist instruments...as its approaches advance more, the more it needs Marxism to finally lay itself out fully in the plan of Marxism.”⁴¹ For this reason, the author insists in that only Marxist theory could study and comprehend dependency adequately, for what there was to remove completely the structural-functionalist elements adhered to it since its formation.

A large quantity of criticisms to TMD – many of them unfounded and with very unstable arguments – were forged not knowing, or omitting, the epistemological level in which the political debate emerged in the middle of 60s in Latin America, basically to explain the problems in delays, dependency, and underdevelopment, as well as the paths of transformation and liberation. In parts, it obeyed the silencing

impact of the military dictatorship and to the intellectual and media censure that institutionalized and that, in Marini's case provoked, due to his own trajectory, exiled from his country for nearly 20 years, that his thinking and fundamental contributions are just now being known and going back to reading in Brazilian classes, in the universities, and in the academic communities many times against the currents, including the dominant left, for example, in universities such as that of São Paulo or in UNICAMP, where to this date there is a strong resistance to its reception on behalf of these institutions, of their academic communities and, still, of the majority of the professors. And the same occurs in a good part of the Latin American academic centers where his reception is extremely restricted.

Even Marini indicated that what needs to be done to revitalize and update dependentist thinking in its Marxist components is:

... to resume the thread at the point where we lost it in the 60s; resume Marxism, the only effective weapon that the left has to analyze and comprehend the world that we live in: the capitalist world in which it lives and use it, therefore, to realize the radical criticism of capitalism, in search of a new popular, democratic project of the masses, that allows for Latin America to come out of the crisis in which it finds itself towards a new economic form that responds to the interests of the large majorities and not only to the interest of the groups of national and foreign capital.⁴²

And, of course, that this is a collective task of theoretical, methodological, and political construction in light of the changes of all orders that have operated in the last years – and are in process – in world capitalism. Despite the discredit and the intents in forgetting him, Marini – along with other intellectuals like the very Gunder Frank and the Brazilian philosopher Álvaro Vieira Pinto, practically unknown to this date, as Gilberto Vasconcellos⁴³ suggests, epistemologically, Marini is reemerging with new energies: not necessarily among the generation that practically “gave its arm to twist” to commit to the fashionable, mercantilist theoretical perspectives; but in the lines of the new generations, the workers, and other forces and social and popular movements. For example, MST of Brazil has reinvented Marini, and other representatives of popular, academic, student movements have also done so, who are looking to TMD even more. Including in social networks, collectives have emerged that frequently promote Marini's thinking and stimulate its discussion, as well as electronic means of communication interested in its diffusion.⁴⁴

In its more radical version, Marxist dependency theory does not admit to “reforming capitalism” as some intellectuals and social democratic governments of all signs tied to the designated “third via” proclaim; but to assume the necessary transit towards original, libertarian, and profoundly democratic socialism that does advance to overcome the regime of private property of the means of production, exploitation of the labor force by the capital, and the imperialist domination system that the State has as its main ally, as suggested in numerous writings by the North American writer James Petras.

From the perspective of TMD, we think there are new problems and lines of research that are necessary to elucidate. Thus, at the level of concepts, I consider the prefix *neo* to give them concrete proposing content as a function of the architecture of the *sketch* of Marini's *dependency theory* with a core articulated in the super-exploitation of the labor force that, in real terms, means that the worker is expropriated by the capital from the part of his depth of reproduction and of the value of his force of work, and this is converted in a source of capital accumulation. Essentially, Marini outlined this thesis for countries that operate in conditions of structural dependency – in particular Latin American countries – and that today, due to scientific, technological development and the secular crisis of historic capitalism, the whole of the capitalist system is generalizing itself in a geometric progression towards the fall, in this, of its compounded rates of growth and productivity.

We consider that, instead of the negative effects that in the social thinking produced the Soviet Union's fall and the affirmation of the Washington Consensus, among other occurrences ideologically

utilized by neoliberalism to announce the “end of history” and the “arrival of democracy” as an “antidote” against libertarian socialism, a kind of reversion occurred, along with the structural, systematic, and civilizatory crisis of capitalism since 2008-2009 that marked the beginning, if slowly and unequal, of the re-emergence of critical and Marxist thinking in general as a theoretical and analytical horizon of reflection in a very important nucleus of European intellectuals and thinkers and even in the United States.⁴⁵

Holistic thinking is coming back – against the unidimensional fragmentation imposed by neoliberalism - ; to take away all the cobwebs that imposed on us the neoliberal straitjacket and begin to rescue and refresh topics such as the theory of value-labor, unequal exchange, the transfers of surplus-value to advanced centers, the State's role, and the super-exploitation of the work force, et cetera, with the purpose to understand the essentialness of the contemporary economic, social, political, and cultural problematic.

I consider that these are some reflections that merit to make an homage to whom in the social sciences as well as in the critical and revolutionary left intellectual circles should consider as a true organic intellectual of economic, social change in favor of the workers and oppressed and exploited peoples of Latin American countries and countries dependent on the periphery of the world capitalist-imperialist system in the contours of this monumental historical, social process marked by structural changes and transformations that express, each time more intensely, the growing difficulties and contradictions that world capitalism is going through throughout this twenty-first century.

Conclusion

Unlike the neoliberal, social democrat, and neo-developmentist approaches today in crisis, which in their moment presented a promising panorama for the countries in “vias of development,” as they like to classify the countries dependent on international organisms like the World Bank, IMF, the *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development* (OECD), and the BID, among others; the panorama that tends towards “independence” and “sovereignty” of the nations and work force, on the contrary, the dependentist theses envision a tendency to the exacerbation of the super-exploitation of work and of the class struggles stimulated by flexibilization of work that occurs in the productive dimension of our societies through impulse-imposition of all types of “structural reforms” proclaimed by the dependent bourgeoisie and by international monetary and financial organisms. Additionally, faced with the structural crisis of world capitalism, new forms of expansion of countries and capitals are reinforcing themselves, revitalizing sub-imperialism, as in the case of Brazil and others in the world, like Israel, Iran, South Africa, or Nigeria, without ignoring the tendency to militarism and intervention through war (Syria, Iraq, Libya, Ukraine) by the part of imperialism as a form of maintaining the system of domination under its hegemony that each time loses terrain before the emergence of new powers, singularly China and Russia, and of progressive governments that demand the recovery of their sovereignty before the attempts of Balkanization and national disintegration that supreme and hegemonic powers of imperialism commanded by the United States, Germany, France, England, and Japan, among others, promote.

These are – mainly – the new contemporary topics that need to be approached and developed critically and with a historical, contemporary perspective capable of apprehending and explaining the phenomena that today explain its conformity and behavior in altars of a true comprehension capable of contributing to the development and organization of the workers' and popular movements' social struggles in track, not only to “overcome neoliberalism” – which is strategically important to do – but also *capitalism* itself and, even more so, the dependent, that are the true *cause* of *all* the difficulties and calamities that workers and societies in the world endure: exploitation, inequality, misery, hunger, inflation, hopelessness, injustice, unemployment, violence, human rights violations, insecurity, environmental devastation, and fratricidal wars that threaten humanity's existence.

They are topics to update critically TMD and Marini's thinking – and not, in his name, reject him – in this wave of phenomena and of the limits that historic capitalism is reaching, and I do not say its definitive fall – which is desirable – the intolerable structural limits whose nature is necessary to inquire into to create new concepts and categories that finally construct superior alternatives of the future, capable of transcending this monstrous system of salaried slavery and misery sustained in the capitalist mode of production to contribute to speeding up its imminent historical decadence.

For this strategic objective, TMD and Marini's thinking, and under the self-criticism and recovery of the master lines of Latin American social thought of the twentieth century, should propose itself to recreate a *new theoretical base*, alternative for the twenty-first century capable of apprehending and characterizing historical reality in its totality, its surreptitious tendencies, and the secular cycles in which our peoples, communities, and societies of Our America find themselves immersed.

In synthesis, an urgent elaboration with the renewed force of critical thinking and a theory placed at the service of peoples and science, as a visible path that makes it possible to collectively erect a new economic, social, and human world order, without exploitation or regimes of domination and misery based, for the first time in the history of humanity, on liberty, democracy, and on social and human relations of equality and fraternity among men, peoples, societies, and communities.

Bibliographic References

- Arrizabaló Montoro, Xabier, *Capitalismo y economía mundial*, Instituto Marxista de Economía-ARCIS-UdeC, Segunda Edición, Madrid, 2016.
- Bagú, Sergio, *Economía de la sociedad colonial. Ensayo de historia comparada de América Latina*, coedición, Grijalbo-Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, México, 1992.
- Bambirra, Vania, *Teoría de la dependencia: una anticrítica*, ERA, México, 1978.
- Blomström Magnus, y Björn Hettne, *La teoría del desarrollo en transición*, México, FCE, 1990.
- Carcanholo, Reinaldo, *Capital, essência e aparência*, Vol.2, *Expressão Popular*, São Paulo, 2013.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, "Notas sobre el estado actual de los estudios de la dependencia", en: Sergio Bagú y et. al., *Problemas del subdesarrollo latinoamericano*, Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, México, 1976, tercera edición. Versión en internet: http://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/34470/S7400554_es.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- CEPAL, *Boletín Económico de América Latina*, vol. 7, n. 1, febrero 1962, p. 1-24. Versión en internet: http://prebisch.cepal.org/sites/default/files/2013/prebisch_el_desarrollo_eco.pdf.
- CEPAL, *El desarrollo económico de la América Latina y algunos de sus principales problemas*, Santiago, 1949.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri, Charles Bettelheim, Amin y Christian Palloix, *Imperialismo y comercio internacional. Cuadernos de pasado y presente*, núm. 24, Córdoba, 1971.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri, *El intercambio desigual. Ensayo sobre los antagonismos en las relaciones económicas internacionales*, Editorial Siglo XXI, México, 1972.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri, *L'Échange inégal. Enssai sur les antagonismes dans les rapports économiques internationaux*, Maspero, 1969.
- Fornet-Betancourt, Raúl, *Transformaciones del marxismo. Historia del marxismo en América Latina*, Plaza y Valdés, México, 2001.
- Frank, André Gunder, *América Latina: subdesarrollo y revolución*, ERA, México, 1969.
- Frank, André Gunder, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil*, Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- Frank, Gunder André, *Acumulación dependiente y subdesarrollo*, Era, México, 1979.
- Furtado, Celso, *O capitalismo global*, Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro, 1998.
- Furtado, Celso, *Subdesarrollo y estancamiento en América Latina*, Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1966.
- Germani, Gino, *La sociología en la América Latina*, Eudeba, Buenos Aires, 1964.
- Germani, Gino, *Política e massa, Estudos Sociais e Políticos* 13, *Edições da Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos*, Minas Gerais, 1960.
- Germani, Gino, *Política y sociedad en una época de transición*, Paidós, Buenos Aires, 1968.
- Lenin, V.I., *¿Quiénes son los amigos del pueblo?*, Editorial Siglo XXI, Madrid, 1974.

- Marini, Ruy Mauro *Memoria*, Archivo de Ruy Mauro Marini, disponible en: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/002_memoria_marini_esp.html.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *América Latina: dependência e integração*, Brasil Urgente, SP, 1992.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, "El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente", en Úrsula Oswald (coord.), *Mercado y dependencia*, México, Nueva Imagen, 1979, pp. 37-55.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, "Estado y crisis en Brasil", *Cuadernos Políticos* núm. 13, julio-septiembre de 1977, pp. 76-84.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, "Las razones del neodesarrollismo" (respuesta a F.H. Cardoso y J. Serra), *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Año XL/VOL. XL, Núm. Extraordinario (E), IIS-UNAM, México, 1978, 57-106.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, "Plusvalía extraordinaria y acumulación de capital", *Cuadernos Políticos* No. 20, México, abril-junio de 1979, pp. 18-39.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Crisis, cambio técnico y perspectivas de empleo*, Cuadernos de CIDAMO No. 9, 1982.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Sobre el patrón de reproducción de capital en Chile*, Cuadernos de CIDAMO no.7, s/f. Existe versión en internet: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/061_reproduccion_capital_chile.html.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Sobre el patrón de reproducción de capital en Chile*, México, Cuadernos de CIDAMO No. 7, 1981.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Subdesarrollo y revolución*, Editorial Siglo XXI, México, 1985, 12ª edición.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, ERA, México, 1973.
- Marx, Karl, *El capital*, vol. 1, cap. 1, México, Siglo XXI, 2000.
- Marx, Karl, *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política (Grundrisse)*, Siglo XXI, México, 8ª edición, vol. II, México, 1980.
- Pinto, Vieira, *Consciência e Realidade Nacional*, 1960.
- Pinto, Vieira, *Ideologia e Desenvolvimento Nacional*, 1956.
- Pinto, Vieira, *O conceito de tecnologia*, 2005.
- Prebich, Raúl, *Capitalismo periférico: crisis y transformación*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, México, 1987.
- Rostow, Walt Whitman *Las etapas del crecimiento económico, un manifiesto no comunista*, México, FCE, 1974.
- Smith, John, *Imperialism in the Twenty-First Century: Globalization, Super-Exploitation, and Capitalism's Final Crisis*, Monthly Review, 2016.
- Sonntag, Heinz, *Duda, certeza y crisis. La evolución de las ciencias sociales en América Latina*, UNESCO-Editorial Nueva Sociedad, Caracas, 1989.
- Sotelo Valencia Adrián, *Crisis capitalista y desmedida del valor: un enfoque desde los Grundrisse*, coedición Editorial Itaca-UNAM-FCPYS, México, 2010.
- Sotelo Valencia, Adrián, *The Future of Work. Super-exploitation and Social Precariousness in the 21st Century*, Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2015.
- Sotelo, Adrián, *Entrevista a Ruy Mauro Marini: "Las perspectivas de la teoría de la dependencia en la década de los noventa"*, Revista *Estudios Latinoamericanos* núm. 9, CELA-FCPyS-UNAM, México, julio-diciembre de 1990, pp. 49-58.
- Sunkel, Osvaldo y Pedro Paz, *El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoría del desarrollo*, Siglo XXI, 9ª ed., México, 1976.
- Traspadini, Roberta, *A teoria da (inter)dependência de Fernando Henrique Cardoso*, Outras Expressões, São Paulo, 2014.
- Varios Autores, *El ladrillo. Bases de la política económica del Gobierno Militar chileno*, publicado por el Centro de Estudios Públicos en Santiago de Chile en el año de 1992, disponible en: <http://www.memoriachilena.cl/archivos2/pdfs/mc0032306.pdf>.
- Vasconcellos, Gilberto Felisberto, *Gunder Frank. O enguiço das ciências sociais*, Editora Insular, Florianópolis, 2014.
- Vitale, Luis, *Interpretación marxista de la historia de Chile*, tres volúmenes, Editorial LOM Ediciones, 1ª reimpresión, Santiago de Chile, 2013.
- Weber, Max *Ensayos sobre metodología sociológica*, Amorrortu, Buenos Aires, 1982.
- Williamson, John, *El cambio en las políticas económicas de América Latina*, Gernika, México, 1991.
- Williamson, John, *Latin American Adjustment, How much has happened?*, Institute of International Economics, Washington, D. C. 1990.

1 Ruy Mauro Marini, *Memoria*, Ruy Mauro Marini File, available at: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/002_memoria_marini_esp.html. For more details where Marini analyzes POLOP, see: Marini, Ruy Mauro, *Subdesarrollo y revolución*, Editorial Siglo XXI, México, 1985, 12ª edición, especially p. 50 and ss.

- 2 Fernando Henrique Cardoso, "Notas sobre el estado actual de los estudios de la dependencia", en: Sergio Bagú y et. al., Problemas del subdesarrollo latinoamericano, Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, México, 1976, tercera edición, p. 98. On-line version at: http://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/34470/S7400554_es.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- 3 Cardoso, "Notas sobre el estado actual...", op. cit., p. 103.
- 4 Regarding this, see Roberta Traspadini, A teoria da (inter)dependência de Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Outras Expressões, São Paulo, 2014.
- 5 For this topic, see: Reinaldo Carcanholo, Capital, essência e aparência, Vol.2, Expressão Popular, São Paulo, 2013. As far as is known, this author was the first to tie the fictitious capital concept exposed by Marx in Volume III of Capital with the fictitious profits concept.
- 6 Raúl Fernet-Betancourt, Transformaciones del marxismo. Historia del marxismo en América Latina, Plaza y Valdés, México, 2001, p. 276.
- 7 Adrián Sotelo, Entrevista a Ruy Mauro Marini: "Las perspectivas de la teoría de la dependencia en la década de los noventa", Revista Estudios Latinoamericanos núm. 9, CELA-FCPyS-UNAM, México, julio-diciembre de 1990, p. 53.
- 8 Vania Bambirra, Teoría de la dependencia: una anticrítica, ERA, México, 1978, p. 26. The author insists on the internal character, adhered, of imperialism within the structures of dependency. At the level of social formation, specificity is captured, including, the concept of country and its difference with the mode of production developed by Marx. For one approach of this topic, see: V.I. Lenin, ¿Quiénes son los amigos del pueblo?, Editorial Siglo XXI, Madrid, 1974.
- 9 Luis Vitale, Interpretación marxista de la historia de Chile, tres volúmenes, Editorial LOM Ediciones, 1ª reimpresión, Santiago de Chile, 2013, pp. 172-173.
- 10 Ruy Mauro Marini, Marini, América Latina: dependência e integração, op. cit., p. 90.
- 11 According to Marx, the organic composition of capital is the synthesis of the relation between the value composition and technical composition of capital, see: Marx, El capital, vol. 1, cap. 1, México, Siglo XXI, 2000, p. 517. For the concept, owner of capital reproduction, see: Ruy Mauro Marini, Marini, Sobre el patrón de reproducción de capital en Chile, Cuadernos de CIDAMO no.7, s/f. On-line version: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/061_reproduccion_capital_chile.html.
- 12 The topic of crisis I develop in my book: Crisis capitalista y desmedida del valor: un enfoque desde los Grundrisse, coedición Editorial Itaca-UNAM-FCPYS, México, 2010, placing it from the angle of the crisis of value production and surplus-value.
- 13 The Ten Commandments of the Washington Consensus (formally announced as the Diez Áreas de Políticas de Reforma (Ten Areas of Reform Policies)) was the result of the presentations and acts of a Conferencia Internacional (International Conference) summoned by the Institute of International Economic Studies in the United States on November 6 and 7, 1989, and in which economists from 8 Latin American countries (Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela) met and whose compilation was under the charge of John Williamson, Latin American Adjustment, How much has happened?, Institute of International Economics, Washington, D. C. 1990. La versión en castellano: John Williamson, El cambio en las políticas económicas de América Latina, Gernika, México, 1991, synthesizes the conclusions of this Conference also known as the Decálogo del Consenso de Washington (The Ten Commandments of the Washington Consensus) (pp. 27-58). This consensus governs to this date in dependent and underdeveloped countries, and the majority of the governments follow its dogmas and precepts to the letter.
- 14 The foundational document is: El desarrollo económico de la América Latina y algunos de sus principales problemas which is dated in 1949 and was later published by CEPAL, in its Boletín Económico of Latin America, vol. 7, n. 1, febrero 1962, p. 1-24. On-line versión: http://prebisch.cepal.org/sites/default/files/2013/prebisch_el_desarrollo_eco.pdf.
- 15 Raúl Prebich, Capitalismo periférico: crisis y transformación, Fondo de Cultura Económica, México, 1987.
- 16 A good exposition of this topic is found in: Osvaldo Sunkel y Pedro Paz, El subdesarrollo latinoamericano y la teoría del desarrollo, Siglo XXI, 9ª ed., México, 1976.
- 17 For example, see his O capitalismo global, Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro, 1998.
- 18 Gino Germani, Política e massa, Estudos Sociais e Políticos 13, Edições da Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos, Minas Gerais, 1960; Gino Germani, La sociología en la América Latina, Eudeba, Buenos Aires, 1964; Gino Germani, Política y sociedad en una época de transición, Paidós, Buenos Aires, 1968.
- 19 Cf. Max Weber, Ensayos sobre metodología sociológica, Amorrortu, Buenos Aires, 1982 y Walt Whitman Rostow, Las etapas del crecimiento económico, un manifiesto no comunista, México, fce, 1974.
- 20 On explanation of these two perspectives is found in: Sonntag, Heinz, Duda, certeza y crisis. La evolución de las ciencias sociales en América Latina, UNESCO-Editorial Nueva Sociedad, Caracas, 1989, p. 98 y ss.
- 21 Heinz Sonntag, Duda, certeza y crisis, op. cit., p. 98.
- 22 Heinz Sonntag, Duda, certeza y crisis, op. cit., p. 101.
- 23 Celso Furtado, Subdesarrollo y estancamiento en América Latina, Buenos Aires, EUDEBA, 1966, p. 97.
- 24 Celso Furtado, Subdesarrollo y estancamiento en América, op. cit., p. 100.
- 25 Ruy Mauro Marini, Dialéctica de la dependencia, ERA, México, 1973, p. 91. El artículo de Cardoso al que alude Marini es: "Notas sobre el estado actual...", op. cit.
- 26 Sergio Bagú, Economía de la sociedad colonial. Ensayo de historia comparada de América Latina, coedición, Grijalbo-Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, México, 1992.

27 See Luis Vitale Interpretación marxista de la historia de Chile, op. cit. In this line also André Gunder Frank, Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: historical studies of Chile and Brazil*, Monthly Review Press, 1967. For an analysis of the work and thinking of Gunder Frank, see: Gilberto Felisberto, Vasconcellos, Gunder Frank. *O enguiço das ciências sociais*, Editora Insular, Florianópolis, 2014.

28 The book elaborated between 1970 and 1972 entitled: *El ladrillo. Bases de la política económica del Gobierno Militar chileno*, published by the Centro de Estudios Públicos (Center of Public Studies) in Santiago de Chile in 1992, is considered the first neoliberal document of the political economy of the dictatorship elaborated by students of the designated School of the Chicago Boys. It is available at: <http://www.memoriachilena.cl/archivos2/pdfs/mc0032306.pdf>.

29 Ruy Mauro Marini, *Memoria*, s/f, on-line version: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/002_memoria_marini_esp.html.

30 Among others: "Estado y crisis en Brasil", Cuadernos Políticos núm. 13, julio-septiembre de 1977; "Las razones del neodesarrollismo" (respuesta a F.H. Cardoso y J. Serra), *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Año XL/VOL. XL, Núm. Extraordinario (E), IIS-UNAM, México, 1978, 57-106.; "El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente", en Úrsula Oswald (coord.), *Mercado y dependencia*, México, Nueva Imagen, 1979; "Plusvalía extraordinaria y acumulación de capital", Cuadernos Políticos No. 20, México, abril-junio de 1979; *Sobre el patrón de reproducción de capital en Chile*, México, Cuadernos de CIDAMO No. 7, 1981; *Crisis, cambio técnico y perspectivas de empleo*, Cuadernos de CIDAMO No. 9, 1982.

31 For an approach and criticism to the theories of development that flourished after the second world war, see: André Gunder Frank, *América Latina: subdesarrollo y revolución, ERA*, México, 1969. For criticism of the Latin American currents, see: Ruy Mauro Marini, *América Latina: dependencia e integração*, op. cit.

32 *Memoria*, op.cit.

33 It is useful to remember the origin of the unequal exchange discussion among authors like A. Emmanuel, Bettelheim and Amin, and which seemed to have no effects — at least, directly — in Latin American discussions, in particular, in the development of dependency theory. Arghiri was one of the main authors that displaced the theory of comparative costs of international commerce base don Price analysis, to study the unequal exchange among nations from the exchange of unequal quantities of labor in detriment of underdeveloped countries. Therefore, one asks: "Does the dogma of immobility of factors hinder us from seeing a certain category of countries, regardless of what they produce and export, (that) they always change a greater quantity of national labor for a lesser quantity of foreign labor?", the answer is affirmative and, thus, his theory of unequal exchange develops. A. Emmanuel, *El intercambio desigual. Ensayo sobre los antagonismos en las relaciones económicas internacionales*, Editorial Siglo XXI, México, 1972, p. 34. The original edition of this book in French is: *L'Échange inégal. Essai sur les antagonismes dans les rapports économiques internationaux*, Maspéro, 1969. The debate over unequal Exchange appeared in Arghiri Emmanuel, Charles Bettelheim, Amin and Christian Palloix, *Imperialismo y comercio internacional. Cuadernos de pasado y presente*, núm. 24, Córdoba, 1971. It is important to mention that in Marini's work, no reference to this discussion is made and that CEPAL (in the figure of Raúl Prebisch, for example) only developed a theory of "the deterioration of the exchange terms) that omitted the important problema of the transfers of value and production prices that operate at the market level.. Therefore, Magnus Blomström and Björn Hettne consider that: "The development of an unequal Exchange theory was not, then, directly tied to the Latin American school of dependency, even when various Latin Americans worked on the same topic," *La teoría del desarrollo en transición*, México, FCE, 1990, p. 107. Gunder Frank constitutes an exception, who not only participated in the unequal Exchange debate, but also formulated very severe and extremely useful criticisms for incorporating the phenomenon to recent Latin American studies, see: André Gunder Frank, *Acumulación dependiente y subdesarrollo, ERA*, México, 1979, p. 110 y ss.

34 We should observe that Marx's discovery of the law of the falling tendency of profit rates, in volume III of *Capital*, in its fundamental contribution since "In theoretical terms, this is expressed in the culmination of *Capital*: the law of descending tendency of profit rates. This law explains, dialectically, the intrinsically contradictory character of capitalist accumulation, from which important implications and, in particular, the need of a growing increase of exploitation are derived," Xabier Arrizabaló Montoro, *Capitalismo y economía mundial*, Instituto Marxista de Economía-ARCIS-UdeC, Segunda Edición, Madrid, 2016, p. 81. In this way, "Marx's theoretical approach, which uproots the law of value, culminates, therefore, with the law of descending tendency of profit rates, which explains capitalism's limits," (Ibid, p. 146). Marx confirms this thesis in his *Grundrisse*, when, in relation with the falling tendency of profit rates, he affirms that: "It is this, with all respect, the most important law of the modern political economy and the essence in comprehending the most difficult relations. It is, from a historical point of view, the most important law. It is a law that, despite its simplicity, has not been comprehended until now and, much less, has been expressed consciously," Marx, Karl, *Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política (Grundrisse)*, Siglo XXI, México, 1980, 8ª edición, vol. II, p. 281.

35 *Memoria*, op.cit.

36 *Memoria*, op. cit. Influenced by Paul Baran, Gunder Frank sustains this same thesis in his main writings.

37 *Memoria*, op. cit. (Cusivas nuestras).

38 *Memoria*, op. cit.

39 For a radical criticism of dualism, see: André Gunder Frank, *América Latina: subdesarrollo y revolución, ERA*, México, 1969.

40 We developed this topic in our book: *The Future of Work. Super-exploitation and Social Precariousness in the 21st Century*, Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2015.

41 Adrián Sotelo, Entrevista a Ruy Mauro Marini: “Las perspectivas de la teoría de la dependencia en la década de los noventa”, Revista Estudios Latinoamericanos núm. 9, CELA-FCPyS-UNAM, México, julio-diciembre de 1990, p. 53.

42 Adrián Sotelo, Entrevista a Ruy Mauro Marini...op. cit., p. 56.

43 Gilberto Felisberto Vasconcellos, Gunder Frank. O enguiço das ciências sociais, Editora Insular, Florianópolis, 2014. p. 101 y ss. The author cites Vieira Pinto, who Paulo Freire called the “Brazilian master,” his posthumous and unpublished book O conceito de tecnologia written in 1973 and published in 2005. He wrote as well, among others, Ideologia e Desenvolvimento Nacional (1956) and Consciência e Realidade Nacional (1960).

44 It is the case, for example, of the rebellion magazine, <http://www.rebellion.org/>; of La haine, <http://www.lahaine.org/> and of Periodismo Internacional Alternativo (PIA), <http://www.noticiaspia.org/>, among others.

45 It is the case, for example, of John Smith, Imperialism in the Twenty-First Century: Globalization, Super-Exploitation, and Capitalism’s Final Crisis, Monthly Review, 2016, which in some way resumes the thinking of Latin American authors and of Marini in his concept of super-exploitation of work.