

PLUS ÇA CHANGE . . . :  
THE ENGLISH EDITION OF CARDOSO  
AND FALETTO'S *DEPENDENCIA Y  
DESARROLLO EN AMÉRICA LATINA*\*

Robert A. Packenham  
Stanford University

The publication of the English edition of Cardoso and Faletto (1979) is a "happening," an "event." Consider the following:

*Of all the approaches* to development, particularly Latin American development, of the last fifteen years, none has had deeper or more pervasive influence, especially in the United States, than the dependency perspective.

*Of all the writers* who have used the dependency perspective, none has been more acclaimed and influential, especially in the United States, than the Brazilian sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso.

*Of all Cardoso's* writings about dependency, none is more important than the book he wrote with the Chilean Enzo Faletto, *Dependencia y Desarrollo en América Latina* (1969). For many, it is the locus classicus of the dependency literature. For Stepan (1978, p. 234) it is "one of the most sophisticated formulations of the dependency argument." For Domínguez (1978a, pp. 106–8, 115) it represents the very top of "a hierarchy of commendable approaches" for studying inter-American relations in the 1980s. For Collier (1978, p. 6) it is "the seminal study that underlies [the bureaucratic authoritarian] literature." For the Valenzuelas (1978, p. 553) it is one of the two "principal works in the dependency perspective," a perspective which they regard as essential to understand Latin American "underdevelopment." By 1979 there had been sixteen printings of this book in Spanish and an undetermined number of printings of a Portuguese translation originally published in 1970. Numerous

\*An earlier version of this article was presented at the Stanford-Berkeley Colloquium on Latin American Studies, Stanford, California, 29 May 1980. It is a byproduct of a larger study of the nature, context, and consequences of the dependency perspective in general and Cardoso's work in particular. The larger study has been supported at various times by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, the National Fellows Program of the Hoover Institution, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and the Institute for the Study of World Politics. Responsibility for the views expressed here is entirely my own.

commentators have lamented the absence of an English edition of this book. Now, at last, there is one.

*Of all the versions* of this book presently available,<sup>1</sup> none reflects their views at such length in such a considered and up-to-date fashion as the English edition. A new Preface and Post Scriptum have been added. The text itself has also been quite substantially supplemented. The publication by a North American university press suggests that the book is intended for an academic readership more than for political consumption in Latin America. If there is a definitive version of this book, one can reasonably argue that this is it.

These considerations are more than sufficient to establish that (a) the spread of dependency ideas, especially in the United States,<sup>2</sup> is a significant episode in inter-American cultural relations, and (b) the book by Cardoso and Faletto plays a central role in that episode, which is still unfolding. Therefore their book is not only a scholarly work to be assessed like any other, but also a primary source document for the student of ideas in their historical, intellectual, and social context. This means that one needs to analyze similarities and differences in different editions, the significance of these continuities and changes, and the social settings and consequences of these ideas as well as the ideas themselves. This is the way the book will be treated in this essay.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, what follows describes the principal ways in which the English edition adds to, subtracts from, changes, and (not least) maintains the continuity of the original edition—first in the text itself, then in the new Preface and Post Scriptum. It also discusses the significance of these changes and additions.

One crucial caution: beware the “everybody knows” syndrome. There are features of dependency generally, and of Cardoso’s approach more specifically,<sup>4</sup> that “everybody knows.” There are so many of these features in the literature that some flatly contradict others; it is logically impossible for all of them to be true. Yet many people, including scholars, are prepared to endorse, or dismiss out of hand, arguments about Cardoso’s work without even considering the evidence on the grounds that “everybody knows” he did or did not make this or that argument. Cardoso himself often uses this technique to defend his work and attack the work of others.<sup>5</sup> In this kind of situation the best course is to pay close attention to the evidence of what actually has and has not been said and to be skeptical of claims that are not supported by citations and evidence.

## CHANGES AND ADDITIONS IN THE TEXT

*The Nature of the Changes and Additions in the Text*

The opening sentence of the new Preface is, "We wrote *this book* in Santiago, Chile, between 1965 and the first months of 1967" (p. vii, emphasis added).<sup>6</sup> The opening sentence of the new Post Scriptum is, "Although ten years have elapsed since *this book* was written, we have maintained its original structure and interpretations, for any attempt to bring it up to date would be futile" (p. 177, emphasis added.)<sup>7</sup> The English edition is not, however, the same book the authors wrote in Santiago that was first published in 1969. Not only have the new Preface and Post Scriptum been added, but also there are a great many changes in the text of the book itself.

Cardoso and Faletto's claim to have maintained the "original structure and interpretations" is *literally* true, especially if the word "basic" or "essential" is added before "original." But this claim is also misleading, especially in light of their statement that "this book" is the one written in Santiago between 1965 and 1967. Indeed, the only hint anywhere in the entire volume that significant changes and additions have been made in the text itself is in the front papers, where it is stated that "This is an *expanded and emended* version" of the original work (p. iv, emphasis added).<sup>7a</sup> This notification is very cryptic and ambiguous, however. Given the opening sentences of the new Preface and Post Scriptum, and the absence of any other notice about changes in the English text compared to the original text, readers of the English edition will assume that "expanded" refers to the new Preface and Post Scriptum and that "emended" refers only to fairly minor corrections in the text. Indeed, these are precisely the meanings given the same words (*corregida y aumentada*) in the front papers of the fourteenth and fifteenth printings of the book in Spanish in 1978 and 1979, respectively (p. vi). These printings retain the original text and add only the Post Scriptum. In the English edition, by contrast, significant and numerous "expansions and emendations" have also been made *in the text itself*.

What are these textual additions and changes? How significant are they? Where do they occur? Since there is no description or even identification in the English edition of the location and character of these important changes and additions, it is worthwhile to describe some of them here.

Let us first notice some gross quantitative changes in the lengths of chapters. The table shows the number of pages in each chapter in the Spanish, Portuguese, and English editions of the book. The pages of the Portuguese edition are larger than the Spanish edition and therefore the former has fewer pages than the latter (134 to 164 pages, respectively, omitting the respective prefaces). Nevertheless, the ratio of the number

Lengths of Chapters in Three Editions of Cardoso and Faletto

Chapter	Number of Pages in:			Ratios	
	Spanish	Portuguese	English	Port. to Span.	Eng. to Span.
1	8	7	7(6)	.88	.88 (.75)
2	28	23	21	.82	.75
3	15	13	45	.87	3.0
4	48	39	53	.81	1.1
5	28	23	22	.82	.79
6	31	25	23	.81	.74
7	6	5	5(4)	.83	.83 (.67)
Pages Summed	164	135	176	.82	1.07
Actual Pages	164*	134*	176**		
Pages Summed minus Chaps. 3 and 4	101	83	78(76)	.82	.78 (.75)

Sources: Cardoso and Faletto (1969, 1970, 1979).

\*Preface omitted.

\*\*Preface and Post Scriptum omitted.

Numbers in parentheses for chapters 1 and 7 are functional equivalents in short chapters.

of pages in the chapters in the Portuguese edition to the number of pages in the same chapters in the Spanish edition is very consistent, that is, a little more than four-fifths as many pages in each chapter. This consistency suggests that the actual lengths of the chapters in the Spanish original and the Portuguese translation are the same or nearly the same and that no major additions or deletions were made in the Portuguese version. Qualitative inspection of the two texts confirms that the Portuguese translation is quite faithful to the original Spanish, with extremely few changes, additions, or deletions.

In the English edition the pages are also larger than in the Spanish edition. Nevertheless, there are *more* pages in the English edition than in the Spanish edition (176 to 164 pages, respectively, omitting the prefaces). Obviously there has been a net increase in the length of the English edition. Moreover, the number of pages in the chapters in the English edition relative to the number of pages in the chapters in the Spanish edition is very *inconsistent* across chapters, ranging from about two-thirds as many pages in chapter 7 to about three times as many pages in chapter 3. Chapters 3 and 4 have had the biggest increases in number of pages. In the other chapters changes, deletions, and addi-

tions also have been made but their net effects are not perceptible from this quantitative analysis; they will be noted below.

The biggest additions by far are in chapter 3, "The Period of 'Outward Expansion'." In the Spanish edition this chapter has fifteen pages, whereas in the English edition it has forty-five; since the English pages are larger the chapter is actually about four times as long as the original. In Spanish this chapter has five footnotes; of these five footnotes only one is to a scholarly source—a book by Celso Furtado alleged to have been published by Yale University Press in 1965, which in fact does not exist. In English, by contrast, this chapter has twenty-three footnotes, including the nonexistent Furtado book but also a number of scholarly sources that do exist. Among these latter the most important and frequently drawn-upon source is Tulio Halperín Donghi's *Historia contemporánea de América Latina* (1969) published in Madrid the same year the original Spanish edition of Cardoso and Faletto was published and two years after Cardoso and Faletto say they completed writing it.

In the Spanish edition chapter 3 is entirely schematic. It is devoted exclusively to delineating two abstract categories that the authors say are fundamental to their entire work, namely, "nationally controlled" and "enclave" economies; no historical or descriptive material is presented. In English, by contrast, the chapter is mainly historical and descriptive. Most of it (pp. 30–66) is a factual survey of "situations" of dependency in Latin America between 1810 and the first third of the twentieth century. Given the span of years and countries they set out to cover, their treatment is, as they themselves note (p. 30), necessarily brief and superficial—one might even say, in a different sense than before, that it is schematic history; but it is still much less abstract than the treatment in the Spanish edition, which has almost no historical material whatsoever.

The other chapter where there has been a substantial net increase in length is chapter 4, "Development and Social Change: The Political Role of the Middle Classes," whose original title was "Desarrollo y cambio social en el momento de transición." This chapter is half again as long in the English edition as in the Spanish edition. In the Spanish edition there are eight footnotes; in the English edition, fifteen. As in chapter 3, the additions are mainly, if not exclusively, descriptive material on "concrete, historical situations." For example, the treatment of the Peruvian case on pp. 116–22 of the English edition is more than three times longer than the treatment in the Spanish edition (pp. 95–96), and the discussion of several cases on pp. 105–12 is richer and longer than the original pp. 78–82. The material that is added draws on sources published in 1970 (p. 107) and 1972 (p. 118)—that is, sources postdating the original publication of the Spanish edition in 1969.

But additions such as these are not the only changes in the text of the English edition compared to the Spanish edition. There are also a great many deletions of varying size, some of which are quite significant.<sup>8</sup> An important methodological section, "Structure and Process: Reciprocal Determination" (pp. 13–16), illustrates the point. Parts of this section have been rewritten for the English edition. For example, the Spanish edition (p. 18) characterizes as "ingenuous" the idea that "temporal sequence" is important for "scientific explanation." This point in the original edition was important. It articulated the authors' remarkable epistemological premise that a phenomenon could be explained by events that occurred after the phenomenon itself occurred.<sup>9</sup> It was thus an important window on their unfalsifiable way of knowing. But this passage is deleted in the English edition. Similarly, the following passage appeared in the original Spanish text:

Recognizing these differences [between present-day developed countries and the situation in Latin American countries], we go on to criticize the concepts of underdevelopment and economic periphery and to stress *the concept of dependency as a theoretical instrument for emphasizing both the economic aspects of underdevelopment and the political process by which some countries dominate others, and some classes dominate others, in a context of national dependency. As a result, we stress the specificity of installations of capitalist production in social formations in dependent societies.* [Spanish edition, pp. 161–62, emphasis added]

In the English edition (p. 173) the italicized phrases are deleted. The deletion of the phrase, "*the concept of dependency as a theoretical instrument*" is particularly significant because the authors and others have so often insisted that for them dependency is *neither* a concept *nor* a theoretical instrument (English edition, pp. xii–xiii, xiv, xx, xxiii; Cardoso 1977, p. 22; Caporaso 1978, p. 22; Duvall 1978, pp. 56–57, 63, 68; Palma 1978, pp. 905, 911; Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, pp. 546, 551, 552). Interestingly, these phrases are *not* deleted from the 1978 and 1979 Spanish printings with the new Post Scriptum.

Other significant modifications in the text will be noted and discussed in the next section.

### *The Significance of the Changes and Additions in the Text*

Although the revised text adds new material on more or less "concrete situations," it by no means follows that this new material affects the arguments of the book. Indeed, it does not affect them at all. For instance, the authors now claim that "the present [i.e., late twentieth century] situations [of dependency] *cannot be understood* without an analysis, however brief, of the historical situations [in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries] that explain how Latin American nations fit into the world system of power and the periphery of the international

economy" (p. 30, emphasis added). They then present their analysis of "historical situations" between 1810 and the early part of the twentieth century (pp. 30–66). However, in the original version the authors also claimed to understand the present situations, in terms of the same theoretical argument as in the English edition; yet the original edition did not contain any of the concrete analysis of "historical situations" that they now present for the first time on pp. 30–66. To the contrary, this new material, which they now say is essential to understand the present situations, in fact draws heavily on sources that became available only after they formulated their original arguments and indeed after their book was originally published.

The new material thus provides some belated, though still very slight, measure of support for the repeated claims of Cardoso and Faletto that they place great stress on concreteness and specificity; but it has no substantive effect. The case material—old and new—either sits in unasimulated fashion within the capacious boundaries of their three "basic situations," neither affecting nor affected by their theoretical arguments; or it is interpreted rigidly within that theoretical framework. In neither instance do the data affect the argument.

The material that has been added does not support the claims Cardoso and Faletto have made about their methodology. Cardoso (1977, p. 23) has characterized his approach to dependency analysis as "historical-structural" and has argued that in it "the specificity of concrete situations is a precondition for any analytic formulation." He and Faletto make a similar claim in the new Preface (pp. xvi–xvii): "Our analyses of concrete situations require us to find out what forms of social and economic exploitation there are, to what degree industrialization and capital accumulation in the periphery has [sic] advanced, how local economies relate to the international market, and so forth. . . ." <sup>10</sup> But it is not the analysis of concrete situations that is a "precondition for any analytic formulation," <sup>11</sup> that "requires" them to "find out what forms of social and economic exploitation there are" and "how local economies relate to the international market," or that generates, as Palma says, "the essential aspects of the dependency analysis" (1978, p. 911). To the contrary, the "analytic formulations" are found in the sweeping, holistic, unfalsifiable Marxist theoretical orientation that controls their interpretations of concrete cases. <sup>12</sup> It is this theory, not the analysis of concrete cases, which "requires" them to "find out what forms of social and economic exploitation there are." They do not infer theory from cases; they apply theory to cases. Data are never allowed to test or modify or reject Cardoso's main hypotheses; they are allowed only to illustrate or confirm them. The passages in the original text that refer to "the concept of dependency as a theoretical instrument" and that deny that "temporal sequence" is important for scientific explanation are much better



guides to the methodology Cardoso and Faletto actually use than the kinds of methodological claims just quoted.

The authors are more successful in meeting some very specific criticisms of the original edition that have been levelled by Marxist authors in *Latin American Perspectives*. Once again, however, the additions that have been made do not affect significantly their theoretical argument. Thus, Cueva (1976, p. 14) complained about the 1969 edition that "The book does not even mention the invasions in the Caribbean by the United States, creating colonial or semi-colonial situations without which it is impossible to understand that region's history, and which are ill-described by the ambiguous term 'enclave'." Cueva was quite right about the 1969 edition; he is not right about the 1979 English edition, because the authors have added three pages densely packed with facts and figures on U.S. invasions, colonialism, and neocolonialism in the Caribbean and Central America (pp. 63–66). Cueva (p. 15) also criticized Cardoso and Faletto for ignoring the Cuban Revolution in their book and again his charge is close to the truth: there are only two passing references to Cuba in the original version (pp. 25 and 136; pp. 19 and 154 in the English edition). In the English edition, however, there are no fewer than thirteen entries under "Cuba" in the index (nine of which are in the Post Scriptum and two of which are in the expanded section of chapter 3). Again, however, the effect of these changes on the substantive argument is not perceptible. The additional references to Cuba are not used to sharpen the authors' views regarding the nature of socialism, the conditions that bring it about, etc. The authors continue to prescribe "socialism" as the only genuine solution for Latin America but they also continue to say nothing regarding the nature of socialism or the ways to achieve it.

The other modifications in the English translation that were noted are of two different kinds and are significant for two different reasons. The first of these changes relates to the question of when the original version of this book was written. In all the fifteen printings of the Spanish edition from 1969 through 1979, Cardoso and Faletto say they wrote it "between 1966 and 1967" (p. 1). In the English edition they say they wrote it "between 1965 and the first months of 1967" (p. vii, emphases added). The dates are of interest in relation to the appearance of André Gunder Frank's book *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, first published in January 1967. Frank says he wrote his book "between 1963 and 1965" (1974, p. 89). According to Frank, Faletto read Frank's manuscript in draft and provided written comments on it which Frank incorporated into his book sometime before July 1966 (Frank 1967, pp. xv, 65–66). Cardoso and Faletto do not discuss the influence if any of Frank's book on their book and they make no mention of it or reference to it in either the Spanish, Portuguese, or English editions. Given the



large impact Frank's book had in Latin America between 1967 and 1969, this is perhaps a bit surprising or at least notable.

The book by Cardoso and Faletto was first published in 1969. The earliest date of any *publication* on dependency by Cardoso or Cardoso and Faletto that I have been able to find is 1968 (in Jaguaribe et al.).<sup>13</sup> A mimeographed version of a draft of the *first two chapters* of the eventual book was distributed by the Instituto de Estudios Peruanos in Lima in March 1967 (Cardoso and Faletto 1967). Cardoso (1977, p. 22) and others have cited a mimeographed document by Cardoso and Faletto, with the same title as the eventual book, coming out of the Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificación Económica Social (ILPES) in Santiago in 1967. Whether this is a draft of the entire manuscript, or the same draft of the first two chapters as the one distributed in Lima, I have not been able to determine.

Cardoso has explicitly minimized the importance of the question of who wrote what when ("the question of in whose head the thunder-clap was produced" [Cardoso 1977, p. 8]). But in the same article he also repeatedly stakes a claim to his own priority: ". . . my own book on slave society in Southern Brazil . . . [was] *already published* when Gunder Frank discussed his thesis on 'feudalism' and 'capitalism'. . . . The draft version [of the 1967 ILPES manuscript] was distributed in Santiago in 1965. . . . Theotonio dos Santos . . . presents a similar view in the study he wrote *after* the discussion in Santiago of the essay written by Faletto and myself. . . ." (Cardoso 1977, pp. 22–23, notes 3–6, 8, and 13, emphases added). More recently Cardoso has again stated flatly (1979, p. 316) that it was *he* who founded the dependency school: "The first version of dependency studies in connection with development was a report that I presented at ILPES in 1965. Following this report Enzo Faletto and I published *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*, whose first complete version was circulated in 1967, at ILPES."

Palma and Kahl endorse Cardoso's claims. Palma (1978, p. 909, emphasis added) makes a point of referring to "the *completion in 1967 of Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*." He also follows Cardoso in arguing (p. 911) that Cardoso's work on Brazilian slavery (Cardoso and Ianni 1960; Cardoso 1962) "foreshadowed" his work on dependency in general and his "rejection of the stagnationist theses" in particular. Similarly, Kahl states (1976, pp. 137–38) that "By 1967 Cardoso and Faletto had finished a document that was circulated in mimeographed form and published two years later (after some hesitancy with ECLA about its suitability) as *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*." Kahl also writes (p. 137) that "dependency was a phrase then [1964–67] gaining currency in Chile, although used by other men in somewhat different ways"; in a footnote to this statement Kahl adds (p. 189) that "Two books in English give alternative approaches to that of Cardoso but

within the broad dependency framework; both authors were in Santiago in the middle 1960s: André Gunder Frank (1969) and Keith Griffin (1969).” By stating that Cardoso “wrote the first paper using that term in 1965” (p. 136), stressing that Cardoso and Faletto finished their work in 1967, noting that Frank was in Santiago in the “middle 1960s,” and dating the publication of Frank’s book in 1969 instead of 1967, Kahl seems to invite the inference that the work by Cardoso and Faletto preceded Frank’s work and that the former might have influenced the latter.

Thus, Cardoso’s disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding, there is manifestly a great deal of concern by him and others about the date and the author or authors of the “thunderclap.” We cannot resolve all the questions that have been raised, but we can note a few salient points. Cardoso continued to support “stagnationist theses” in the first chapter of his book with Faletto first published in 1969 (and now again in the English edition); rejection of those theses came only in chapters 6 and 7 of their book. Cardoso’s statement that “*The draft* version [of the 1967 ILPES manuscript] was circulated in Santiago in 1965” is contradicted by his own statements, noted earlier, that he and Faletto wrote the book “between 1966 and 1967” (Spanish edition) or “between 1965 and the first months of 1967” (English edition). Similarly, although, as noted, Cardoso claimed in 1979 that his 1965 ILPES report was “the first version of dependency studies in connection with development,” he himself has pointed out that this 1965 report, entitled “*El proceso de desarrollo en América Latina*,” did not use the concept of dependency and did not present a typology of dependency. As he says, “the *concept* of this typology [of dependency] was only produced later in my [i.e., Cardoso’s] collaborative work with Enzo Faletto, ‘*Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*,’ published by ILPES in 1967” (Cardoso 1972, p. 9; emphasis in original). Cardoso’s statement also contradicts Kahl’s contention that Cardoso wrote the first paper using the term “dependency” in 1965.

At this point, the following conclusions are warranted. First, Frank’s book was published a full two years before Cardoso and Faletto’s. Second, Frank wrote his book before Cardoso and Faletto wrote theirs. Third, Faletto saw Frank’s manuscript at least six months before he and Cardoso finished their manuscript. Fourth, it is plausible, though not demonstrated, that Frank’s work on dependency influenced Cardoso and Faletto’s book. Fifth, it is less plausible and certainly not demonstrated that Cardoso and Faletto’s work on dependency influenced Frank’s book.

The other category of changes that must be noted is those modifications that make the text of the English edition more consistent with recent trends of events and ideas than the original text was. For ex-

ample, in the Spanish edition the authors state that, while the formation of a strong state sector "does not preclude" greater degrees of autonomy for industrialized countries in Latin America, on the other hand "the earlier forms of organization and control of production, including those which relate to dependency, *do not disappear* from the scene" (p. 150, emphases added.) In English the first part of this passage ("does not preclude") is strengthened ("a greater measure of autonomy of internal decisions *can be attained*") and the second part is actually reversed: "The earlier forms of organization and control of production, *even as regards dependence, do disappear* from the scene" (p. 163, emphases added.) This modification takes account of reductions in degrees of national dependency in Latin America during the last decade that were not anticipated in the 1969 version.

The final chapter especially has been either revised in the direction of more recent thinking, or translated poorly, or both. For instance, there are at least three unambiguous changes or mistranslations of key terms from pp. 164–65 of the Spanish edition to page 175 of the English edition: "external interests" become "internal interests"; "domination of the economic system" becomes "diversification of the economic system"; "The basic economic conditions of dependency" becomes "The basic economic conditions of development." In each of these cases the change is quite significant: the stress on the "internal" more than the "external" aspects of dependency, the belated recognition of the trends toward diversification of Latin American economies, and the shift from stressing "concrete situations of dependency" to stressing "concrete situations of development."<sup>14</sup>

#### THE NEW PREFACE AND POST SCRIPTUM

The English edition has a new "Preface" and a new "Post Scriptum." The Preface deals with conceptual, methodological, theoretical, and epistemological questions. The Post Scriptum deals with trends in the international system and in Latin America during the last ten years. These additions constitute a very substantial increment, since taken together they run to more than two-fifths the length of the original Spanish and Portuguese texts and about one-third the length of the "expanded and emended" English text. The fourteenth printing (1978) and subsequent printings of the Spanish edition include the Post Scriptum (in Spanish, of course) but not the new Preface.

These new sections are significant additions to the corpus of Cardoso's writings on dependency. They are especially valuable to readers unfamiliar with Cardoso's writings in Portuguese and, to a lesser extent, Spanish. Unlike the modifications in the text itself, which the reader can discover only through the type of close analysis done in the previous

section, the Preface and Post Scriptum are, of course, clearly identified. For this reason, not because they are less important, in this essay we shall devote less space to them than we have to the textual changes. Still, a few major analytic points about these new sections can and should be made.

First, the Post Scriptum, which deals exclusively with the last decade, is the least schematic, most detailed discussion of “concrete situations” in the entire volume. To be sure, just as in the text itself (if not more so), the facts of these “situations” are always interpreted strictly according to Cardoso’s holistic theoretical perspective. Nevertheless it is notable that much more factual material is presented in the new sections than anywhere else in the book. For this reason Cardoso and Faletto’s disclaimers about this new material are oddly modest: “. . . the last ten years have been too rich in significant events for us to have the illusion that we could summarize them in a few additional pages . . . one or even several new books would be necessary to replace the facile adjectives used above with an analysis of the historical processes involved” (pp. 177, 179; see also p. xxv). These statements are ironic because the authors nowhere offer comparable disclaimers about the much less detailed, concrete, specific treatment of “significant events” over much longer periods of time in the text itself.

In fact, and this is the second point, nowhere in the new Preface or Post Scriptum do Cardoso and Faletto offer any disclaimers or second thoughts about *anything* in the original text. There is not one sentence—not one word—expressing the slightest modification or reconsideration of anything they wrote ten years earlier. The important changes in the text itself described above might be considered to be implicit acknowledgement of weaknesses that needed to be strengthened. But there is no explicit acknowledgement of this sort; to the contrary, even the notification of these modifications is extremely cryptic and ambiguous, as we noted earlier. The authors refer repeatedly to alleged (and usually undocumented) misconceptions that others have about dependency and about their writings; but they neither state nor imply any mistakes or weaknesses in what they themselves wrote.<sup>15</sup>

Third, Cardoso and Faletto make a number of methodological claims, especially in the Preface, which they do not carry out and which in fact are often precisely contrary to the methodology they actually use. Thus, they claim repeatedly to be interested in specific, concrete situations more than theoretical abstractions, but the weight of the book, and of Cardoso’s other writings on dependency, overwhelmingly contradict them. They claim (pp. ix–xiv) to emphasize change and to use a dialectical approach, but the only changes they discuss are those from one to another form of dependency, and their “dialectic” is frozen solid along these lines. They claim (pp. x, xiii, xvii–xviii) to rely on “historical-

structural" factors to explain events, but in fact their analysis of "the new dependency" of "associated-dependent development" from about 1950 to present, in chapters 6 and 7 and the Post Scriptum, ignores completely the enclave/nationally controlled economy dichotomy that was the major "historical-structural" distinction of the early chapters. They claim (pp. xiv, xxii) that their approach enables them to see and predict "unanticipated" events, but in fact their perceptions and predictions are either wrong, dubious, or vacuous. For instance, they contend that industrialization in Latin America occurred "at the expense of the autonomy of the national economic system and of policy decisions for development" (p. 162), and they "point out" that in the "present situation of the industrialized and dependent countries of Latin America," there is "increasing control over the economic system [sic] of nations by large multinational corporations" (p. 174). But industrialization has hardly destroyed national autonomy in Latin America. Indeed, a number of analysts (e.g., Packenham 1976, Lowenthal 1976, Fishlow 1978/79, Lowenthal and Fishlow 1979, Sigmund 1980) have argued that in recent decades, especially the late sixties and the seventies—precisely the years that most concerned Cardoso and Faletto—most industrializing Latin American countries have on balance reduced their dependency. Cardoso and Faletto predict (p. xxiv) that the 1980s will bring either more dependent capitalism or a change to socialism; such a statement is doubtless true but not helpful since, given their definitions of the terms, these are the only conceivable outcomes—any imaginable events will fit the "prediction." They claim (pp. x–xi, xiii–xiv, xxiv, 176) to propose "historically viable" and desirable alternatives, but they say nothing about such alternatives except that they advocate "socialism," which they resolutely refuse to define or analyze concretely.

Fourth, substantively the main value of the new Preface and Post Scriptum is to show conveniently and clearly, within one set of covers (a) a few of the many contradictions and ambiguities in Cardoso and Faletto's work, and (b) that these contradictions are consistently resolved in an holistic, unfalsifiable Marxist direction rather than in a non-Marxist direction, as many commentators have maintained. This is a matter of considerable importance. Contradictions and ambiguities are at the heart of Cardoso's approach. So are the resolutions in Marxist terms. Both the contradictions and their resolution are presented as clearly and richly in the English edition as anywhere in Cardoso's writings.

Thus, Cardoso and Faletto first state or imply that "associated-dependent development" under capitalism might be desirable or at least acceptable (pp. xi, 1–7); then they state quite clearly that the only acceptable developmental solution is socialism (pp. xxiii–xxiv; also pp. 209–16). First they define dependency in national terms and give detailed descriptions of reductions in degrees of national dependency in

the last decade (pp. xx, 180–99); then they switch to a class definition of dependency, declare the information on reduced national dependency to be irrelevant, and affirm that their “concern is not . . . to measure degrees of dependency in these terms” but rather “the nature of class conflicts and alliances which the dependency situation encompasses” (pp. 201, 212). First they describe how Latin American states have become powerful and relatively autonomous of class forces; then they say that states *always* “express” class “interests” and that “in the end the long-term policies must be compatible with the social bases of the state” (pp. 199–216, quotations at pp. 209–10). In this fashion, by using vague, infinitely elastic concepts and phrases such as “in the end,” “long term,” and, above all and always, “interest,” Cardoso and Faletto are able simultaneously (a) to include numerous qualifications and hedges that can make their position seem subtle and unorthodox, and also (b) to argue an utterly dichotomous, holistic, unfalsifiable position which is, as the Brazilian political scientist Simon Schwartzman has correctly noted (1977, pp. 169–70), an “orthodox class position, the explanation in the most conventional Marxist terms of all politics by the confrontation of groups and classes without reference to the problematic of the state. . . .”<sup>16</sup> One of the major virtues of the English edition is to show that whenever Cardoso and Faletto resolve such contradictions it is always in the latter direction rather than the former.

Why do such contradictions occur? And why are they resolved in this way rather than some other way? In part they occur because Cardoso mixes elements of the social science of Max Weber and other non-Marxists with the Marxism that is the main foundation of his approach.<sup>17</sup> This mixture has been noted before by both supporters and critics of Cardoso’s work. For example, Kahl (1976, p. 129), who is basically supportive, says that Marx and Weber have been Cardoso’s “main models.” Cueva (1976, p. 13), a critic ideologically to Cardoso’s “left,” accurately and perceptively describes the 1969 edition of Cardoso and Faletto as “a book whose main points are difficult to organize and discuss because it utilizes two theoretical frameworks, Marxist and ‘desarrollista’, and it lends itself to two interpretations depending on what you emphasize and what specific meaning you attribute to the concepts used.”

Although both supporters and critics have commented upon the mixture, however, few writers have perceived correctly how the resulting contradictions are resolved. Cueva (pp. 14–15) says that “In general, it is the analysis of classes and class conflict which is the Achilles heel of dependency theory. . . . [Cardoso and Faletto] fall into the error of studying the state without reference to the class structure. . . .” This part of Cueva’s interpretation, which is excellent on the whole, was dubious before the English edition appeared; as we have seen, it is explicitly and totally rejected in the English edition. Cueva—and others



who have made similar criticisms of Cardoso's approach, such as Castaneda and Hett (1979)—might have worried less. Supporters of Cardoso's work, who are much more numerous than critics, have also failed to perceive that although Cardoso is eclectic, ambiguous, and contradictory, he is much more faithful to Marxist postulates and criteria than to non-Marxist ideas. These supportive authors, usually eclectics or non-Marxists themselves, have tended simply to read their own ideas into Cardoso's work.<sup>18</sup> From their perspectives, they might have worried more.

The contradictions and their resolution in a Marxist rather than a non-Marxist direction also result from Cardoso's conception of the fundamental unity of scholarship and politics. For Cardoso, social science is not an enterprise separate from political struggle; it is a "tool" in that struggle (1977, p. 16). Contradictions and ambiguities are useful politically, and Cardoso uses them brilliantly to build support and attack critics in the academic arena. The contradictions in Cardoso's approach to dependency analysis thus result not only from the Weberian/Marxian eclecticism of his work but also from the tactical imperatives of political struggle. The resolution of these contradictions in the Marxian rather than the Weberian direction results from Cardoso's holistic theoretical premises, his unfalsifiable epistemology, and above all his conception that social science is and ought to be subordinated to political struggle and "historical agents," in his case the "agents of socialism" (1977, p. 16).

Thus, such contradictions and ambiguities can only be resolved in the Marxist direction. Cardoso's premises about the fundamental unity of scholarship and politics (rather than the fundamental separation of them as in Weber's view or in the classical "liberal" conception) have deep roots in specific historical and structural features of the relation between intellectuals and society in Latin America. To suppose that Cardoso could resolve these contradictions any other way is to fail to understand the profound significance of these features in his work and that of other neo-Marxian intellectuals in Latin America.

There is, moreover, a clear continuity in Cardoso's work over time. Cardoso is not a "permanent heretic"; nor have his views moderated and become less consistent with the tenets of Marxism over time, as some have claimed (e.g., Domínguez 1978a, pp. 106–08). Read in isolation, the original version of Cardoso and Faletto has (understandably) confused some readers about the way the contradictions between Marxist and non-Marxist claims are resolved, or if they are resolved at all;<sup>19</sup> read in conjunction with Cardoso's other writings of that time and subsequently, however, Cardoso's continuing fidelity to Marxist tenets is clear. The 1979 edition clearly and strongly supports the repeated earlier claims by Cardoso and Palma to this effect.<sup>20</sup>



In 1978, before the appearance of the English edition and before I had seen any of the new material in it, I wrote as follows (Packenham 1978, pp. 14–15) about the dependency perspective in general and Cardoso's work in particular:

What really is at issue is not national dependence or autonomy but rather "socialism." Reduced to its essentials, the dependency perspective is a massive prescription for "socialism." National dependency or autonomy is a secondary concern; arguably it is not a concern at all. Dependencia was a misnomer. . . . The dependency writers are willing to use arguments about national dependency as long as the facts fit their preconceptions; but when the facts diverge they readily jettison national autonomy as a pertinent criterion. Far and away the most important value—arguably the only value—in the dependency perspective is Marxist socialism.

Yet even this conclusion, accurate so far as it goes and essential, is misleading, because socialism is less a value or even constellation of values than a symbol. The content of socialism is extremely vague and open-ended before it comes into being; its content after it comes into being remains a matter of acrimonious dispute among socialists as well as nonsocialists.

The 1979 English edition amply and ringingly supports every aspect of that assessment—including the points in the second paragraph which have been slighted here. Cardoso and Faletto say very little beyond a few general, formal abstractions ("justice," "equality," etc.) about socialism. They refer to Cuba as a socialist country but they do not analyze it concretely. There is next to nothing in this book, or anywhere else in their writings, saying what socialism is, how one would know it if one saw it, how it works "concretely," etc. Very significantly, they provide no guidance whatsoever about how to achieve it. If it is true, as they say, that "*The important question . . . is how to construct paths toward socialism*" (p. xxiv, emphasis added), then this book and their other writings simply do not address that question, for they deal almost entirely with capitalism and say virtually nothing either about socialism or about how to achieve it.

There are, as we have seen, many noteworthy changes and additions in the English edition. But as Cardoso might put it, in contradictory fashion, the more things change the more they are the same.

#### NOTES

1. These are: (1) the original Spanish edition (1969); (2) the Portuguese translation (1970); (3) the fourteenth printing (1978) and subsequent printings of the Spanish edition, which are identical to the original version except that they also contain the new Post Scriptum (but not the Preface and the textual changes) of the English edition; and (4) the English edition (1979).
2. I stress the impact on scholars in the United States because I know it best and because, interestingly enough, it was greater than the impact on scholars in Brazil and possibly other Latin American countries.
3. Because of space limitations, the subject of the social settings and consequences of Cardoso's ideas cannot be addressed here. All translations are mine unless otherwise

- indicated. When referring to the original version of the book I normally cite the Spanish text rather than the Portuguese translation (which is virtually identical) because more readers know the Spanish version and because it is the original text.
4. In this article I use the terms “Cardoso” and “Cardoso and Faletto” interchangeably. Partly this is because Cardoso’s many other writings in this field are related and I mention the other works as they are pertinent. Partly it is simply to avoid repetition. Significantly, Cardoso himself does not distinguish the ideas in Cardoso and Faletto from his own ideas, and parts of his joint work with Faletto have appeared under Cardoso’s name only. For example, Cardoso’s contribution to Martins (1977, pp. 205–20) is identical to pp. 199–216 of the English edition, but Faletto is not named as coauthor in the Martins collection. Thus my practice follows Cardoso’s.
  5. For example, Cardoso (1977, p. 12) contends that “the paradigm of dependency is consumed in the U.S. as though its contribution to the historical debate has been centered on a critique of Latin American feudalism” and that “vulgar” dependency analyses “regarded imperialism and external economic conditioning as the substantive and omnipotent explanation of every social or ideological process that occurred.” No evidence is presented to support these charges. No citations are given. In fact, the second charge is clearly false: every dependency writer, “vulgar” or not, sees dependency as having both external and internal manifestations. There is no exception. I do not think that the first charge is accurate or even close to accurate, either; it is certainly not self-evidently true. For example, Domínguez (1978a, p. 108) says that the dependency “school” is consumed in the United States not as “a critique of Latin American feudalism” but rather as postulating a “contradiction between development and dependence.” Although Domínguez calls this “the majority view,” he presents no evidence to support his claim, either. Cardoso and Domínguez concur in the view that André Gunder Frank’s ideas have been more influential than Cardoso’s in the United States. This hypothesis is debatable.
  6. On the dates and their significance, see below.
  7. Notice that the final clause in this sentence is a non sequitur: the opposite of “maintain its original structure and interpretations” is to *change* the structure and interpretations, not “bring it up to date.” In point of fact, the authors *simultaneously* (a) maintain the *essential* “structure and interpretations,” (b) make important changes and additions, and (c) “attempt to bring it up to date” (in the Post Scriptum, pp. 177–216).
  - 7a. For some reason, the reference on p. iv of the English edition is to a 1971 printing of the Spanish edition, rather than to the first printing in 1969. (There were in fact two printings in 1971, one in January, the other in September.) Several readers have told me that they have inferred from this reference that the 1971 book is different from the 1969 book. It is not. They are identical. Indeed, there were thirteen printings of the Spanish edition from 1969 through 1977, and they are all the same. The reference in the front matter of the English edition to the 1971 printing could just as well have been to the 1969 printing or to any of the other eleven printings through 1977. I judge that the English edition refers to the 1971 printing simply because it was the one the translator or publisher had at hand. The reference appears to have no other significance. In any event, the books in Spanish printed in 1969 and 1971 by Siglo XXI are identical.
  8. One deletion that appears not to be very significant, but which should be mentioned for the record, is on p. 161, middle paragraph, seventh line, where the English text omits entirely the bottom four lines of p. 146 and all of p. 147 of the Spanish text. Here it appears as if the translator simply misplaced this part of the Spanish text and inadvertently left it out of the translation.
  9. Lest it be supposed that this extraordinary statement was a slip of the pen which did not express Cardoso’s genuine view, it should be noted that Cardoso makes the same argument elsewhere (1971b, pp. 52–53).
  10. Gabriel Palma, who in all respects concurs with Cardoso, similarly argues that “It is thus through concrete studies of specific situations . . . that Cardoso formulates the essential aspects of the dependency analysis. . . . Cardoso denies . . . that there are any ‘general categories’ within Marxism” (1978, p. 911).
  11. For example, the concepts of “enclave” and “nationally controlled” economies,

which Cardoso and Faletto present as fundamental “analytic formulations” in their book, appear in the English edition after thirty-six pages of case material, but in the Spanish edition they appeared all by themselves without any of the historical material that allegedly was a “precondition” for them.

12. These features of Cardoso’s approach are fundamental. They are also complex. A thorough analysis of them is impossible in the present essay. A brief discussion with a few citations and examples appears in the following section. It is to be stressed that Cardoso himself insists on his fidelity to Marxism (see note 20 below). Nevertheless, many defenders and many critics of Cardoso deny this and are sure they are right. Nowhere is the warning given above against the “everybody knows” syndrome more needed.

A couple of caveats. First, there are many varieties of Marxism, just as there are many varieties of Weberianism, positivism, and falsificationism. The issue here, however, is not what kind of Marxist Cardoso is, but the general approach he uses. (One identifies the character and quality of the wine only after one has determined that the bottle does not contain beer, perfume, or vinegar.)

Second, the substantive ideas expressed in nonfalsifiable, holistic approaches such as Cardoso’s are not necessarily wrong. Indeed, they are often right. But they are wrong *sometimes*. And using a nonfalsifiable epistemology, there is no way to know it. This can be costly, dangerous, and even disastrous. On just this point, see the perceptive remarks by Albert Hirschman (1978, pp. 49–50).

13. This is my own conclusion; it is consistent with the detailed bibliography on Cardoso in Kahl (1976), pp. 190–93.
14. Cardoso wrote a defense of his approach in 1970 entitled “‘Teoria da Dependência’ ou análises concretas de situações de dependência?” Palma wrote another defense in 1978 entitled “Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment or a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment?” The shift in language from “situations of dependency” to “situations of underdevelopment” reflects the change in emphasis.
15. Cardoso’s article “The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States” (1977) similarly criticizes the consumers not the product. It contains only one sentence acknowledging problems in what he (and Faletto) wrote, and even that one sentence is ambiguous: “. . . the original production [i.e., his own writings] . . . may even have included, in latent form, much that later appeared as simplification and inconsistency” (p. 17, emphases added). The rest of the article is entirely about alleged mistakes and distortions of “consumers.”
16. The historian Richard Morse makes a similar point in the form of an irreverent and hilarious parody about one Althussio Cebrapinus Gramescu, “the wisest scholar in the Terra dos Papagaios,” who

had such oracular powers of conceptualization and articulation that his discourse was wholly impenetrable. . . . The importance of Dr. Althussio was that, antropofágicamente, he had eaten Professor Wiggly-PersonaNonGrata, a native of Scotland, and the bruxo of the Terra-Massacre. The Professor had invented a triadic totem: patriarcado idílico–democracia racial–capitalismo benevolente. Dr. Althussio converted the totem of Professor Wiggly-PersonaNonGrata into a tabu and created a new totem unitário called “Dependência.” If the Terra-Massacre needed a totem pluralista, the Terra-Massagem needed a totem unitário, following the dialectic of the Marx Brothers. . . . The new totem had many advantages. It was imaginative instead of empirical. It was systematic instead of intuitive. It was realistic instead of romantic. It was indecipherable instead of decipherable. And each time the Brazilianists discovered an inconsistency the new totem exfoliated at fabulous expense to all the SantasCasas. By the time McLuhanaíma arrived in Piratininga, the Totem da Dependência had progressed through the following stages, sucessiva e antropofágicamente: dependência interna, dependência externa, dependência interina, dependência eterna, dependência independente, independência dependente, interdependência, intradependência, and finally, dependência uterina. [Prowess 1977, p. 71]

17. This is not to say, of course, that Marx (and Engels and Lenin) and Weber are the only significant intellectual influences on Cardoso. Cardoso himself has named Dilthey, Durkheim, Mannheim, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, Merton, Parsons, Redfield,

- Pierson, Bastide, Willems, Azevedo, Fernandes, Touraine, Echavarría, Sartre, Lukacs, and Gramsci, among others, as well as Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Weber, as writers or teachers who have influenced his thinking. (Kahl 1976, pp. 129–36; Cardoso 1977, p. 10).
18. An excellent example is Domínguez 1978a, pp. 106–8 and 1978b, pp. 513–14. Domínguez repeatedly attributes to Cardoso views that Cardoso denounces in the English edition and elsewhere. Other examples are Schmitter 1972, p. 100 and Leonard 1980, p. 461.
  19. An even greater source of confusion was Cardoso's famous essay on "Associated-Dependent Development" (1973). It expresses less of the Marxist side of his approach than almost anything he has written; yet during an important period it was the main source in English of Cardoso's ideas. Not surprisingly, therefore, many readers came to incorrect conclusions about the main features of his approach.
  20. See, among many possible sources, Cardoso 1970, 1971a, 1974, 1977. In these writings, as elsewhere, Cardoso insists on his fidelity to Marxism and is indignant when the point is ignored or challenged. For a useful effort by a very sympathetic author to place Cardoso's work in the flow of Marxist-Leninist theory, see Palma 1978.

## REFERENCES

- CAPORASO, JAMES A. "Dependence, Dependency, and Power in the Global System: A Structural and Behavioral Analysis." *International Organization* 32, no. 1 (Winter 1978):13–43.
- CARDOSO, FERNANDO HENRIQUE. *Capitalismo e Escravidão no Brasil Meridional*. São Paulo: Difusão Europeia do Livro, 1962.
- . "'Teoria de dependência' ou análises concretas de situações de dependência?" *Revista Latino-Americana de Ciência Política* 1, no. 3 (Dec. 1970):402–14.
- . "'Teoria da Dependência' ou Análises Concretas de Situações de Dependência?" *Estudos CEBRAP* (São Paulo) 1 (1971a).
- . *Política e Desenvolvimento em Sociedades Dependentes: Ideologias do Empresariado Industrial Argentino e Brasileiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1971b.
- . "Notas sobre el estado actual de los estudios sobre dependencia." *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales*, No. 4 (Dec. 1972):3–31.
- . "Associated-Dependent Development." In *Authoritarian Brazil*, edited by Alfred Stepan, pp. 142–76. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1973.
- . "O Inimigo de Papel (The Paper Enemy)." *Latin American Perspectives* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1974):66–74.
- . "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States." *LARR* 12, no. 3 (1977):7–24.
- . "The Originality of the Copy: The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Idea of Development." in *Toward a New Strategy for Development*, A Rothko Chapel Colloquium, pp. 53–72, 312–16. New York: Pergamon Press, 1979.
- CARDOSO, FERNANDO HENRIQUE AND FALETTO, ENZO. "Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina." Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Serie Documentos Teóricos No. 1, March 1967. Mimeographed. 37 pp.
- . "Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina." In Helio Jaguaribe et al., *La dominación de América Latina*, pp. 177–221. Lima: Francisco Moncloa, 1968.
- . *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*. México: Siglo XXI, 1969.
- . *Dependência e Desenvolvimento na América Latina: Ensaio de Interpretação Sociológica*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar Editores, 1970.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*, 14th printing, with new "Post Scriptum." Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, English edition of *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina*, with a new "Preface" and "Post Scriptum." Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.
- CARDOSO, FERNANDO HENRIQUE AND IANNI, OCTAVIO. *Cor e Mobilidade Social em Florianópolis*. São Paulo: Editora Nacional, 1960.
- CASTANEDA, JORGE G., AND HETT, ENRIQUE. *El economismo dependientista*. México: Siglo XXI, 1979.
- COLLIER, DAVID. "Industrialization and Authoritarianism in Latin America. *Items* (Social Science Research Council) 31/32, no. 4/1 (Mar. 1978):5–13.
- CUEVA, AUGUSTIN. "A Summary of 'Problems and Perspectives of Dependency Theory.'" *Latin American Perspectives* 3, no. 4 (Fall 1976):12–16.
- DOMÍNGUEZ, JORGE I. "Consensus and Divergence: The State of the Literature on Inter-American Relations in the 1970s." *LARR* 13, no. 1 (1978a):87–126.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cuba: Order and Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978b.
- DUVALL, RAYMOND B. "Dependence and Dependencia Theory: Notes toward Precision of Concept and Argument." *International Organization* 32, no. 1 (Winter 1978): 51–78.
- FISHLOW, ALBERT. "Flying Down to Rio: Perspectives on U.S.-Brazil Relations." *Foreign Affairs* 57, no. 2 (Winter 1978/79):387–405.
- FRANK, ANDRÉ GUNDER. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dependence Is Dead, Long Live Dependence and the Class Struggle: A Reply to Critics." *Latin American Perspectives* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1974):87–106.
- HIRSCHMAN, ALBERT O. "Beyond Asymmetry: Critical Notes on Myself as a Young Man and on Some Other Old Friends." *International Organization* 32, no. 1 (Winter 1978):45–50.
- KAHL, JOSEPH A. *Modernization, Exploitation, and Dependency in Latin America: Germani, Gonzalez Casanova, and Cardoso*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1976.
- LEONARD, H. JEFFREY. "Multinational Corporations and Politics in Developing Countries." *World Politics* 32, no. 3 (Apr. 1980):454–83.
- LOWENTHAL, ABRAHAM. "The United States and Latin America: Ending the Hegemonic Presumption." *Foreign Affairs* 55, no. 1 (Autumn 1976):199–213.
- LOWENTHAL, ABRAHAM, AND FISHLOW, ALBERT. *Latin America's Emergence: Toward a U.S. Response*. New York: Foreign Policy Association, Headline Series No. 243, 1979.
- MARTINS, CARLOS ESTEVAM, ED. *Estado e Capitalismo no Brasil*. São Paulo: Hucitec-CEBRAP, 1977.
- PACKENHAM, ROBERT A. "Trends in Brazilian National Dependency since 1964." In *Brazil in the Seventies*, edited by Riordan Roett, pp. 89–115. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Utopianism: Political Development Ideas in the Dependency Literature." Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Latin American Program Working Paper No. 19. Washington, D.C., 1978.
- PALMA, GABRIEL. "Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment or a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment." *World Development* 6 (1978):881–924.
- PROWESS, M. CAVALCADE; FRANK, TONY; AND O'FIELDS, HARRY [PSEUDONYMS FOR

- RICHARD MORSE]. "McLuhanaíma The Solid Gold Hero; or, O Heroi Com Bastante Caracter (Uma Fuga)." *Almanaque, Cadernos de Literature e Ensaio*, no. 3 (1977):63–74.
- SCHMITTER, PHILIPPE. "Paths to Political Development in Latin America." In *Changing Latin America: New Interpretations of its Politics and Society*, edited by Douglas A. Chalmers, pp. 83–108. New York: Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science 30, no. 4 (1972).
- SCHWARTZMAN, SIMON. "As Eleições e o Problema Institucional (1): Estado e Sociedade no Brasil." *Dados* 14 (1977):164–84.
- SIGMUND, PAUL E. *Multinationals in Latin America: The Politics of Nationalization*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980.
- STEPAN, ALFRED. *The State and Society: Peru in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- VALENZUELA, J. SAMUEL, AND VALENZUELA, ARTURO. "Modernization and Dependency: Alternative Perspectives on the Study of Latin American Underdevelopment." *Comparative Politics* 10, no. 4 (July 1978):535–57.