

This is not the version of record.

The final chapter is: Latimer, Amanda (2022) Situating Ruy Mauro Marini (1932-1997) : movements, struggles, and intellectual communities. In: Latimer, Amanda and Osorio, Jaime, (eds.) The dialectics of dependency. New York, U.S. : Monthly Review Press. pp. 21-105. ISBN 9781583679838

All inquiries for quotation, re-use, or republication should be directed to Monthly Review Press.

Situating Ruy Mauro Marini (1932-1997): His Intellectual Communities, Movements & Struggles, *Amanda Latimer*

In theory, we assume that the laws of the capitalist mode of production develop in their pure form. In reality, this is only an approximation; but the approximation is all the more exact, the more the capitalist mode of production is developed and the less it is adulterated by survivals of earlier economic conditions with which it is amalgamated.¹

The positive relationship between the increase in the productive capacity of labor and the greater exploitation of the worker, which acquires an acute character in the dependent economy, is not exclusive to the latter, but rather is generated by the capitalist mode of production as such.²

Introduction

In 2021, mass social struggles in Latin America have offered hope to people fighting for a humane, dignified and secure existence everywhere. Colombia is now in its fifth month of struggle against state-enforced impoverishment and state violence, particularly against its youth, while the Haitian working people have likewise been mobilized for the past two (hundred) years, insisting that the country is more than one massive sweatshop for US companies. After the same period of struggle, Chilean citizens delivered a surprise victory for left and independent candidates (including 17 Indigenous nominees) to a constituent assembly that will re-write the 1980 constitution that institutionalized the country's neoliberal model, potentially shattering the hold of the right-wing political establishment over the country's bourgeois institutions for the first time in history. Finally, in the country of birth of Ruy Mauro Marini, outrage is peaking against a far-right president and the sectors he represents, following the crass, combative undervaluing of life that characterized the federal government's response to the Covid-19 crisis, which has left over 610,000 people dead at the time of writing.

The conditions in which Marxist dependency theory arose in the mid-1960s are paralleled in the conditions driving these contemporary revolts. These conditions have perhaps inevitably also driven a revival of interest in the framework and its classic texts. In his preface to the first Brazilian edition of Ruy Mauro Marini's *Subdesarrollo y Revolución*, Nildo Ouriques (2012) attributes the return to Marxist dependency theory by a new generation of scholars and movement intellectuals to the suffering of everyday people under a model of development that is not delivering for the majority; and to the degree to which the limits of neo-developmentalism and neo-structuralism are clearly visible, echoing

¹ Karl Marx in Ruy Mauro Marini, "En torno a *Dialéctica de la dependencia*," in *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era, 1973), 82.

² *Ibid.*, 95.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

the crises of their predecessors in the mid-1960s, which has led once again to questions of what kind of development is possible in Brazil and Latin America more broadly, not under neoliberalism, but under capitalism and imperialism.

Ruy Mauro Marini was one of the intellectual giants of 20th century Marxism, having produced one of the most theoretically rich and rigorous accounts of capitalist development and underdevelopment in Latin America, at the heart of which he convincingly located labor superexploitation. Regardless, his work would remain unread and unavailable for much of the latter part of his life.³ In Brazil, his work, and the Marxist approach to dependency theory more generally, would be written out of the country's intellectual life upon his return in 1984, following 20 years of exile, by the remaining traces of authoritarianism and a rising liberal hegemony in the public sphere.

Known in Europe, in the United States and bearer of immense prestige in the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America, for two decades, Ruy Mauro remained an author unknown to new generations who attended university during the dictatorship (1964-1985). With the beginning of the democratic regime, many hoped that the country could begin not only a time of full freedom that was shown to be necessary, but, above all, an intellectual renewal that finally did not occur.⁴

What matters, for Ouriques, is the degree to which the debate and analysis of the class struggle would be weakened in Brazil due the "systematic boycott" of Marini and the Marxist dependency position more generally,⁵ to a devastating degree during the neoliberal era.⁶

In the academic settings of the global North, meanwhile, while it is true that dependency theory "reformed the academic and research curricula in many countries and began to shift the North-centric biases of the social sciences ... helping to decolonize our minds,"⁷ it's also true that the substantial debate on the theme, with no sense of irony, declared its 'death' sometime during the launch of the latest round of globalization in the 1980s. Moreover, it was largely the reformist versions of dependency theory, popularized in

³ A shameless echo of Cristóbal Kay, who wrote that, "Although Marini is, in my view, the most outstanding Marxist *dependentista* he is almost completely unknown in the English-speaking world." Cristóbal Kay, *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment* (London: Routledge, 1989), 144.

⁴ Nildo Ouriques, "Apresentação," in R.M. Marini, *Subdesenvolvimento e revolução* (Florianópolis, Brazil: Insular, 2012), 13.

⁵ Fernando Correa Prado, "Por qué hubo que desconocer a la teoría marxista de la dependencia en Brasil," in P. Olave (ed.), *A 40 años de Dialéctica de la dependencia* (Mexico DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas, 2015), 127-8; Theotonio dos Santos in Cristóbal Kay, "Theotonio Dos Santos (1936-2018): the revolutionary intellectual who pioneered dependency theory," *Development & Change*, Volume 51, Number 2 (2019): 619.

⁶ I should also flag the censorship taking place in Brazilian universities in the lead up to the second turn of the 2018 elections, which took place as I began this essay.

⁷ Kay, "Theotonio dos Santos," 619.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

English translations of the works of Fernando Henrique Cardoso⁸ with weaker groundings (if at all) to Marxist theory, that tended to be used to represent the dependency thesis as a whole in the anglosphere debate. The ramifications of this are summed up nicely by dos Santos here:

Unfortunately ... criticisms [of dependency theory] have not contributed much to the study of the problem as they reveal not only a great ignorance of the recent literature but also of the classic works on the situation of dependent countries. The resulting distortion has provoked a great deal of confusion over the concept of dependence, the relationship between dependency and imperialism, the existence of the dependency situation, the theoretical status of the concept, etcetera..⁹

However, for English-speaking readers, the lack of access to the classic works of Ruy Mauro Marini and his contemporaries also impoverished the debate around class struggle and the world system in the global North, I would argue, in a moment when we needed it most: during the neoliberal phase of imperialism. Far from interpreting the realities of the class struggle in Latin America alone, Marini's analytical framework brings the unity of the global working class into view. Many of his core works¹⁰ shed light on the ordering of workers in successive moments of the international division of labor, organized around different organic compositions of capital and so, different forms and rates of exploitation, but also the operation of the laws of capitalist accumulation (expressed theoretically in Marx's labor theory of value)¹¹ across national boundaries; the implications of which need to be denaturalized and problematized before we are capable of fighting capitalism as a world system and the race to the bottom it requires. The superexploitation that Marini identified as the foundation of dependent social formations is now clearly present in the precarious lives of workers in the global north. As part of a global working class, it stands to reason that we should be part of the same conversation.

It was once appropriate to characterize the work of Marini and his contemporaries, Theotonio dos Santos and Vânia Bambirra (and, to a lesser degree, Andre Gunder Frank) as a 'Marxism in exile'.¹² Due to the dedication of a generation of his students, comrades and colleagues, and their students in turn, this state of affairs is changing.¹³ The majority of the author's written work has been digitized and made available (where possible, in multiple

⁸ For example, Fernando Henrique Cardoso & Enzo Faletto, *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, trans. Marjory Mattingly Urquidí (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 1979).

⁹ Kay, *Latin American Theories*, 163.

¹⁰ Ruy Mauro Marini, *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era, 1973); "Proceso y tendencias de la globalización capitalista," in Ruy Mauro Marini, *América Latina, dependencia y globalización. Fundamentos conceptuales Ruy Mauro Marini, 2ª edición*, coord. E. Sadir & T. dos Santos, ed. C.E. Martins & A. Sotelo V. (Bogotá, Colombia: CLACSO y Siglo del Hombre Editores, 1997).

¹¹ See Marini's own course material on Marx's *Capital*. Ruy Mauro Marini Escritos, "Cursos." Accessed 25 September 2021, http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/007_cursos_marini.html.

¹² Kay, *Latin American Theories*, 241, ft.1

¹³ Mathias Seibel Luce, *Teoria Marxista da Dependência: problemas e categorias – uma visão histórica* (São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2018), 12.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

languages) at the online archive, *Ruy Mauro Marini Escritos*, which is maintained by a team under Jaime Osorio and hosted by the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM).¹⁴ There has been also an array of reissues of Marini's key writings since 2000, including several in his native tongue for the first time. This includes the volume that sparked this project, edited by Roberta Traspadini and João Paulo Stedile, intellectuals associated with the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Terra, and issued in 2005 by a publisher associated with Brazilian mass movements, Editora Expressão Popular in São Paulo.¹⁵ Finally, as part of this recovery mission, publications that shine a light on the systematic boycott of Marxist dependency theory in Brazil more widely also feature in this new bibliography.¹⁶

Thankfully, with the works and ideas of Marini gaining attention in English as well, this is also no longer the case in the global North. With the adaptation of his theoretical framework to the new conjuncture in a variety of works, and the translations of the works of Marini's students, English-speaking readers can join a vibrant and vital discussion with its roots in Latin American social thought. The translation of Marini's major work, *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (1973), is intended to be a one key step in this direction, and I expect it will not be the last.

The objective of this essay is to put the life and work of Ruy Mauro Marini in its social context. The span of his life covers some of the most intense periods of class struggle in Latin America's twentieth century, from the crisis of dependent accumulation that culminated in the 1964 military coup in Brazil, which would drive him into exile for the first time; to the democratic struggles waged by Mexican youth and workers in the late 1960s, brutally put down by the Tlatelolco Massacre in 1968; to the intensified class struggle that overtook Chile in the late 1960s, culminating in the rise of Salvador Allende and the Unidad Popular coalition, which would be crushed in that country's September 11th; to the continent-wide rise of a new counter-revolutionary state and the maturing of the revolutionary left to meet it, bolstered by the Cuban Revolution; and, in the shadow of the Washington Consensus, struggles over the terms of the return to democracy at the end of 20 years of dictatorship in Brazil. In all of this revolutionary and then counter-revolutionary turmoil, Marini took part in revolutionary organizations throughout the continent, transplanting his political focus with every new thrust into exile, but moving consistently in the direction common to the generation of 1968 in the Third World, which positioned its pursuit of socialism in the particular histories and social composition of their respective social formations and, by necessary extension, in the worldwide struggle against imperialism.

It was these tasks that drove him to the search for theoretical answers in the effort to explain the current nature of the socialist revolution in Latin

¹⁴ *Ruy Mauro Marini Escritos*. Accessed 30 August 2021, <http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/>, accessed 30 August 2021.

¹⁵ Expressão Popular would also co-produce a lively documentary on the author, *Ruy Mauro Marini e a Dialéctica da Dependência*, with the Escola Nacional Florestan Fernandes, featuring testimony from many of the friends and comrades mentioned in this text. Available: https://youtu.be/ww4_HoY-UYA, accessed 18 September 2021.

¹⁶ Prado, "Por qué hubo que desconocer."

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

America, its perspectives, and the tasks that would make it possible. This forced him to walk, like the great creators of Marxism, from complex theoretical reflection to revolutionary journalism and the definition of slogans that sought to synthesize the tasks and demands needed to accumulate forces in a given period, through the relentless debate and critique of reformism, reaction and counterrevolution.¹⁷

These experiences also shaped the questions that would give rise to Marxist dependency theory (TMD) in the work of Marini, dos Santos, Bambirra, Frank and many others. In an intellectual climate steeped in development thought from the United States and western Europe (mainly modernization theory and Keynesianism), this generation would reckon with the question of why capitalist modernity, captured in the benchmarks of capitalist development in the US and Britain, had failed to materialize at the periphery of the world system in the supposedly golden age of capitalism; a crisis in the hegemony of imperialist thought that was only exacerbated by the triumph of the Cuban Revolution.¹⁸

Over the course of the late 1960s and 70s, this generation would produce a new reading of Marx's historical materialism, labor theory of value and of classical Marxist theories of imperialism, now from the perspective of dependent social formations, to make sense of their own realities.¹⁹ They examined the ways in which the Latin American economy had taken shape in keeping with world markets of the early modern era, and how this insertion gave rise to a particular, dependent form of capitalism, which saw the laws of accumulation modified in particular ways. Rather than aberrations from a pure form of capitalist development, however, Marxist dependency theorists argued that, "Latin American dependent capitalism is a mature capitalism, that its originality is not due to the absence or lack of capitalism, but rather to the contrary."²⁰

The essay visits Marini's seminal contributions to a series of debates, be it with the traditional communist parties of the region, the structuralist position of the UN's Economic Commission on Latin America (and later, the Caribbean) in the 1960s, or the more reformist and Weberian strands of dependency represented by Fernando Henrique Cardoso a decade later. Over the course of his 65 years, the author would produce five books (published in at least 7 languages, in various editions around the world), over 80 academic articles, investigative reports and conference papers, at least 200 newspaper articles as a journalist in Brazil, Chile, Mexico and as a correspondent for Cuba, as well as a variety of editorials and reports of the various revolutionary groups in which he took part.²¹ But taking a step back, the incredibly rich theoretical and methodological framework that Marini developed moved

¹⁷ Ruy Mauro Marini *Escritos*, "Presentación." Accessed 30 August 2021, <http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/index.html>.

¹⁸ Jaime Osorio, "El marxismo latinoamericano y la teoría de la dependencia," in *Teoría marxista de la dependencia: Historia, fundamentos, debates y contribuciones* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)-Xochimilco, 2016), 54; Kay, *Latin American Theories*, ch.1.

¹⁹ Theotonio dos Santos in Kay, *Latin American Theories*, 143.

²⁰ Jaime Osorio, *Teoría marxista de la dependencia: Historia, fundamentos, debates y contribuciones* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)-Xochimilco, 2016), 9.

²¹ All translations of these texts, and errors that may have resulted, are my own. Please see the translator's note and acknowledgement that follows.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

between the practical deliberations and programmatic articulations of revolutionary tendencies, contact with a variety of living anti-colonial movements for self-determination, fertile discussions with students and colleagues in a variety of academic settings, and long curated friendships embedded in the transformational politics that stretched over decades.

To this end, to situate Marini in the varied social contexts that shaped him and his work, I've leaned quite heavily on his own memoir, an extensive autobiographical statement written in August 1990 in the effort to be readmitted to the faculty of the Universidade de Brasília after a 26-year enforced absence.²² Not only was the text indispensable to the effort to understand the author's intellectual, political and, to an extent, personal trajectory, but this essay takes its impetus from Marini's own comment therein, that "I am very much the product of deep tendencies that have determined the rise of modern Brazil."²³ The essay also uses tributes and testimonials written by former students, friends and comrades following the author's death in 1997. Notably, this includes Vânia Bambirra and, indirectly, Theotônio dos Santos, forces of TMD in their own right who were both lost in recent years, in 2015 and 2018 respectively. Finally, the essay will touch on key turning points in the author's thought that mirrored the variety of roles he played in life, each enriching the next. "Ruy lived as a prisoner of the dilemma between his natural inclinations as a builder of knowledge, thinker and theoretician, and his responsibility as a man of action, a political subject, geared to the task of changing existing social relations."²⁴

²² Ruy Mauro Marini, "Memória: por Ruy Mauro Marini," in *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*, edited by R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2005), 57-134. The memoir is also available in Spanish at Ruy Mauro Marini Escritos, "Memoria." Accessed 31 August 2021, http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/002_memoria_marini_esp.html.

²³ Marini, "Memória," 57.

²⁴ Nelson Gutiérrez Y., "Ruy Mauro Marini: perfil de um intelectual revolucionário," in *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*, edited by R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2005), 263-281.

1. Beginnings: 1932-1960

Ruy Mauro de Araujo Marini was born on May 2nd, 1932, in Barbacena, a small city in the south-eastern state of Minas Gerais, to parents who were only one generation away from the land on either side, albeit from different ends of the social spectrum. His father's parents had emigrated to Brazil from Italy in the eventful year of 1888, when Brazil became the last country in the western hemisphere to abolish slavery. By way of contrast, his mother's family were large landowners in Minas Gerais whose fortunes had declined following that same milestone.

At 18 years of age, Marini relocated to nearby Rio de Janeiro, intending to study medicine. Three years later, however, he would enter the law faculty at the University of Brazil (today, the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro). In this setting, he soon became swept up in the intense debates over nationalism and development that dominated public discourse throughout the decade, in which setting he found himself drawn to the communist position.²⁵ Here, Marini expands his command of languages beyond the basic instruction he received in Latin, Portuguese and Brazilian literature in Barbacena, to include English, French and Spanish. In 1955, Marini entered the newly formed Escola Brasileira de Administração Pública (EBAP, or the Brazilian School of Public Administration) to study social sciences for the first time, under a generally younger cohort of instructors who stood out against the "traditionalist and rarefied intellectual climate" that dominated universities of the day.²⁶

Amongst those who left a mark was the sociologist Alberto Guerreiro Ramos. Ramos's own ideas, particularly regarding the role of intellectuals, technical management and planning in industrial development, were being transformed by the developmentalist discourse of the UN's Economic Commission on Latin America (or CEPAL, its Spanish and Portuguese acronym) and the 1955 Conference at Bandung.²⁷ In the same year, Ramos also acted as a founding faculty member at the Instituto Superior de Estudos Brasileiros (Higher Institute of Brazilian Studies, ISEB), a centre that would become a focus for work on nationalism and development.²⁸ In his own work, Ramos would refer to the concept of dependency, albeit from the perspective of a national bourgeoisie dependent on the development paradigm coming out of the United States. In a 1956 text, the author "argued for the liberation of the bourgeoisie from its semicolonial and underdeveloped mentality to one that was oriented to the country's development."²⁹ The concept may not have had the theoretical elaboration it would receive at the hand of Marini's generation, but it was certainly part of the intellectual climate of this formative period.

In fact, Marini would leave Brazil just as the structuralist approach to development, set in motion by CEPAL, was reaching its peak.³⁰ With encouragement from Ramos, in

²⁵ Marini, "Memória," 60.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ronald Chilcote, *Intellectuals and the Search for National Identity in Twentieth-Century Brazil*, (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 10, 28.

²⁸ Chilcote, *Intellectuals*, ch.2.

²⁹ Ibid., 60.

³⁰ According to Kay, structuralism came about as a response to neoclassical analysis and monetarism which,

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

September 1958, Marini entered Sciences Po, the Paris Institute of Political Studies, to study sociology on a grant from the French government. He would complete his academic formation over the next year and a half, as much through his travels in Europe and encounters with people from around the world, as through his by then systematic study of Marx, Hegel, and particularly Lenin (Marini 2005b, p.62). Crucially, Marini immersed himself in the fervent political debates taking place around him, but equally, in the challenges to the terms of those debates posed by young exiles from the anti-colonial struggles ongoing in Vietnam, Cambodia, Algeria and parts of sub-Saharan Africa. All of these influences would sharpen his positioning in relation to the dominant development paradigms of the day. Reflecting on the impact of his time in France, he would later write that

The theories of development so in vogue in the United States and in European centres were revealed to me as what they really were: an instrument of mystification and domestication of the oppressed peoples of the Third World and a weapon with which imperialism sought to confront the problems created in the post-war period by decolonization (Marini 2005b, pp.62-63).

However, it was the short period to come, at home, that would see the culmination of these experiences in theory and practice; a period ending abruptly with his first expulsion into exile.

2. Brazil: 1960-1964

In mid-1960, Marini returned to Rio de Janeiro to take up a position at the Institute for Retirement and Pensions of Industrial Workers, or IAPI. At the same time, he entered into the major debates taking place on the revolutionary left as a journalist, producing articles for the newly-formed press agency of the revolutionary government in Cuba, *Prensa Latina*, and in *O Metropolitano*, the outlet of the National Union of Students (UNE).³¹ In this role, one that he would return to throughout this life, Marini covered major historical events of

along with Keynesianism, dominated economic and development thinking in Latin America in the post-war setting. Kay, *Latin American Theories*, 2-3, 47. Questioning how useful such frameworks were in the effort to understand the causes of endemic underdevelopment, Latin American development specialists began to stress “the specificity of the peripheral countries,” in relation to those of the core of the world system, and to search for new paradigms to explain their “structures, dynamics, and realities” (ibid., 4). Structuralists, whose thought developed mainly “under the ethos” of CEPAL, were so named due to their focus on historical and structural analysis, and rejection of the methodological individualism on which orthodox economics relied; notably, they rejected neoclassical trade theory and Ricardo’s theory of comparative advantage (ibid., 4-5, 228-9). See also Ana Garcia & Miguel Borba de Sá, “Brazil: From the margins to the centre?” in *The Essential Guide to Critical Development Studies*, edited by H. Veltmeyer & P. Bowles (London: Routledge, 2018), 386. Rather than seeking to ‘escape’ from dependency as such, the structuralist solution was “to know under what conditions more dividends could be gained from participating” in the international system. Garcia & Sá, “Brazil,” ibid.; also Kay, *Latin American Theories*, 127. Other key contributions of structuralism which were addressed by Marxist dependency theory, including structural dualism and the effects of deteriorating terms of trade between the core and periphery, will be picked up below. Kay, *Latin American Theories*, ch.2.

³¹ Marini’s journalistic writings are available at *Ruy Mauro Marini Escritos*: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/005_prensa_marini.html (accessed 23 February 2021).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

the day, whether the anticolonial struggles taking place the world over or key fronts in the Brazilian class struggle. This included the 1961 National Congress of Peasants in Belo Horizonte, and the mass struggle waged by the Peasant Leagues (the antecedent of the landless workers movements that would erupt a decade later) under the leadership of Francisco Julião, which Marini writes was one of highlights of the revolutionary left in this period, all the more due to the ideological battle it provoked with the Brazilian Communist Party. In the pages of *O Metropolitano*, Marini worked to make the lines of this “silent struggle” explicit in novel pieces that “favoured the development of the ideological and political struggle then underway.”³²

In September 1962, Marini joined the University of Brasília, working initially as a teaching assistant and, a year later, an associate professor. He would write that this was one of the most intellectually fulfilling periods of his academic life.³³ The university has been founded only two years prior, in the same year that Brasília (itself a city created in 1960 to act as an expression of modern Brazil) became the new capital of the country. Under the direction of anthropologist Darcy Ribeiro, the institution intended to break from the mould of the traditional university with “progressive curricula, research and teaching methods.”³⁴ But of more importance was the vibrant and talented cohort of intellectuals Marini would meet there, several of whom would become lifelong friends, interlocutors and comrades. This included the German-American sociologist Andre Gunder Frank whose own ideas on the sociology of development and underdevelopment would be deeply influenced by his time in Brazil. But more centrally, Theotonio dos Santos and Vânia Bamberra, with whom the seeds of Marxist dependency theory would develop in a reading group on Marx’s *Capital* and in exchanges initially in Brasília, and later in exile in Chile and Mexico.³⁵

Even prior to his return, however, Marini had entered into contact with militants of Juventude Socialista, the youth wing of the Brazilian Socialist Party (Partido Socialista Brasileiro, PSB), who had intervened in the debate surrounding the crisis of the late 1950s with a strong critique of the Kubitschek government.³⁶ Within months of his return from France, Marini joined the Guanabara (Rio de Janeiro) section of Juventude Socialista, and participation in the formation of a new group, the Revolutionary Marxist Organization-Workers Politics (ORM-PO, Organização Revolucionária Marxista-Política Operária, more generally known by POLOP, after its main publication). Also part of the new formation were dos Santos, Bamberra and Juarez Guimarães de Brito, all of Worker Youth (Mocidade Trabalhista, a current of the Partido Trabalhista Brasileiro, or Brazilian Labor Party) from Minas Gerais; Eder and Emir Sader, Michael Löwy and others from the Liga Socialista Independente (Independent Socialist League) in São Paulo; comrades from the student movement at EBAP in Rio, including Aluizio Leite Filho and Simon Schwartzman; two groups from the northeastern state of Bahia (Aarão Reis F. & Ferreira da Sé 1985: 89; Theotonio dos Santos in, Passa Palavra 2011).

³² Marini, “Memória,” 64.

³³ Ibid., 65.

³⁴ Kay, “Theotonio Dos Santos,” 602.

³⁵ Sadi Dal Rosso & Raphael Lana Seabra, “A teoria marxista da dependência: papel e lugar das ciências sociais da Universidade de Brasília,” *Revista Sociedade e Estado* 31 (2017): 1029-1050.

³⁶ Passa Palavra, “Extrema-esquerda e desenvolvimento (series), part 8/9. Accessed 16 March 2015, <https://passapalavra.info/2011/06/95903/>.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

POLOP was the first expression of the revolutionary left to emerge in Brazil (Marini 2005b, p.62), and it is clear that it provided a collective space of theorization that would also be reflected in Marini's earliest theoretical output (e.g., Marini 1966; see Miranda & Falcón 2010). The tendency came together around a reading of Brazilian society that cut against the grain of dominant leftist frameworks, born of disillusionment with populist slogans of national unity and developmentalism following the break up of the class alliance that had sustained the bourgeois system of domination since the Vargas era of the 1930s. In the words of Erich Sachs, one of the current's intellectuals with whom Marini would develop a deep friendship, a new framework was needed to expose "the penetration of developmentalist ideas in the working class, facilitated by a skilful exploitation of the reigning anti-imperialist feelings amongst the masses" by the bourgeoisie, in an effort to neutralize any organized opposition to its class interests (Sachs [1960] 2009, in Seabra 2020: 665). The dominant bloc

... knew how to take advantage of this movement, when it found it useful, in order to improve its position in the alliance it maintained with imperialism, where it is relegated to the role of 'poor cousin'. ... [T]he problem of anti-imperialist struggle as posed by the so-called left, reinforces the apparent community of interests [between the working class and national bourgeoisie], and once again justifies the sacrifices [demanded of] the proletariat (ibid.).

POLOP's framework directly took aim at the strategy of class conciliation, championed by the Brazilian Communist Party (Partido Comunista Brasileiro, or PCB), which sought an alliance between the native bourgeoisie and working classes in order to stabilize Brazil's industrial development. For example, this observation appears in the thesis "Perspectives on the class struggle in Brazil," approved during the second congress of POLOP in 1963, which Seabra (2020: ft.1) suggests roughly foreshadows Marini's conceptualization of superexploitation.

[B]ourgeois and reformist efforts to structure 'alliances' around the proletariat, the national bourgeoisie and certain sectors of allegedly anti-imperialist landowners ... hide the fact that the Brazilian worker is victim of a double exploitation, that of the national capitalist and of the foreign one which, fighting over their shares of surplus value, remove from the anti-imperialist struggle its class character (POLOP, 1963 in Seabra 2020: 668).

On a second and related point, POLOP called for a grounded analysis of the core social relations, using Marxist categories, that would clarify the character of revolution needed in Brazil. The tendency again levelled a critique of the efforts of communist parties to import revolutionary models that implied that all countries on the same universal path towards capitalist modernity, with any deviations in Latin American economies "given as insufficiencies and other times as deformations" (Seabra 2020: 665). In this regard, POLOP recognized that Brazil was already a "mature capitalist country and not a semi-colonial one according to the PCB thesis." The Brazilian revolution would thus need to be a socialist one – in other words, simultaneously anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist, led by an independent

party of the working class; a role which existing parties had failed to play (Bandeira, in Passa Palavra 2011; Seabra 2020: 663).

It is important to stress that the politics of POLOP cannot be reduced to an early expression of Marxist dependency theory, nor was the latter ever formally adopted by POLOP, possibly due to the diverse political background of its originating members.³⁷ Having said that, Seabra (2020) identifies fundamental concepts and categories that appear in its resolutions, directives and eventual political programme, forged in the “heat of political battle in Brazil between 1959 and 1967” (p.662), which would later be present or re-elaborated in the initial works of Marini, dos Santos and Bambirra from exile; for example, the use of the concept ‘antagonistic cooperation’ in Marini’s conceptualization of subimperialism, which will be discussed below.

Reflecting on this period years later, Marini (2005b) situates the roots of Marxist dependency theory in debates within the ‘new left’ in Brazil more broadly, and strongly rejects the conflation of this new Marxist vision with the PCB’s recycling of CEPAL’s developmentalist positions which coincided with its own tendency to foreground a consciously nationalist bourgeoisie as its subject (Gutiérrez 2005: 264). He writes that the PCB

leaned towards the Cepaline thesis of the deterioration of the terms of trade, structural dualism and the *viability of autonomous capitalist development*, to support the principle of democratic-bourgeois, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution that they had inherited from the Third International.

Positioning itself against this, the ‘new left’ characterized the revolution as simultaneously anti-imperialist and socialist, rejecting the idea of the domination of feudal relations in the countryside and denying that the Latin American bourgeoisie had the capacity to direct the anti-imperialist struggle (Marini 2005b: 66, emphasis added).

The economic and political crisis facing the country, discussed more fully below, would come to a head in this moment, framed on one side by the radicalization of urban and rural workers that the Left struggled to keep pace with, and on the other, by the reactionary backlash of big capital to the modest but ‘basic’ reforms (reformas de base, including banking, tax, urban, electoral, university and crucially, agrarian reforms, as well as the reform of the status of foreign capital) proposed by the left-populist president João Goulart in an attempt to stabilize the country (Seabra 2020: 668, ft.9; Bandeira 2001). Anticipating the coming coup, POLOP observed that the “the contradictions that were deepening and accelerating in Brazil were results of the capitalist development itself” (Seabra 2020: 670; see also Bandeira 2001, ch.5), and could only be met through a revolutionary alliance between subaltern classes in the countryside and cities (POLOP 1963

³⁷ Seabra (2020) notes that there is only one mention of ‘dependency’ in early texts of the current, appearing in relation to the “limits of productivity [under] imperialism due to the ‘low levels of consumption in dependent areas’” (p.666).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

in Miranda & Falcón 2010, p.33). While recognizing that “the history of Latin America ... is divided into two phases: before and after the Cuban revolution,” in his 1990 memoir, Marini explains that

the development of the Brazilian and Latin American revolutionary left (particularly in Argentina, in Peru, in Venezuela and in Nicaragua) was not, as is often passed off, an effect of the Cuban Revolution, but part of the same process that gave rise to it, no matter how strongly its influence was felt in the 1960s, regardless of the fact that it came to exercise a strong influence in the 1960s (Marini 2005b: 63).

The question of turning towards armed struggle would lead to a rift within POLOP, triggering amongst other things the exit of dos Santos, then acting General Secretary (Kay 2019: 602).

For his part, in addition to his teaching duties, Marini had begun work on a doctoral thesis exploring the legacy of bonapartist (or populist) authoritarianism, both under the Quadros and Goulart governments (Dal Rosso & Seabra 2017: 1046). On the first day of the coup, April 1st 1964, the material he had developed to date was destroyed during the military invasion of the University of Brasília. Marini fled to Rio, only to later discover that he had been dismissed by military decree in addition to a dozen other academics.³⁸ Over the next three months, he would be arrested twice. First, by the Naval Intelligence Centre (Cenimar), where he would be tortured. Marini was released on an *habeus corpus* order by the nominally independent Federal Supreme Court (STF), only to be kidnapped once again by the Brazilian Marines and held by the Army (Olave 2015: 12-13). He was released in December 1964, and remained underground for three months until, with constant pressure on his family and attacks on his comrades,³⁹ he was granted asylum in Mexico.

3. First Exile: Mexico, 1964-1969

Pero no cambia mi amor
Por más lejos que me encuentre
Ni el recuerdo, ni el dolor
De mi pueblo y de gente

But it does not change my love
No matter how far away I may be,
Nor the memory, nor the pain
Of my home and my people

Lo que cambió ayer
Tendrá que cambiar mañana
Así como cambio yo
En esta tierra lejana

That which changed yesterday
Will have to change tomorrow
Just as I keep changing
In this distant land.

³⁸ From 2012 to 2015, the University of Brasília held the Anísio Teixeira Commission on Truth and Memory to investigate the civil and human rights violations that took place at the university from 1964 and 1985, named after one of Marini’s student comrades, who, as rector, was removed from office and murdered by the regime in 1971. See Universidade de Brasília. 2019. “Comissão Anísio Teixeira de Memória e Verdade” [press release]. Available: <http://www.comissaoverdade.unb.br>, accessed 6 July 2019.

³⁹ The urban armed struggle of which POLOP was a part would fail, resulting in the persecution, death and disappearance of several comrades, including Juarez Guimarães de Brito (Kay 2019: 603). Marini (1971) would later contribute to a contextualization and critique of POLOP’s efforts in this regard, in a two-volume series that critically evaluated regional movements inspired by the Guevarista *foco theory*, edited by Vânia Bambirra. The chapter would reappear in the fifth edition of *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* (1974a) as “Lucha armada y lucha de clases.”

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

De Todo Cambia, letras de Julio Numhauser.
Cantada por Mercedes Sosa.

From Todo Cambia, lyrics by Julio Numhauser.
Performed by Mercedes Sosa.

At the age of 32, Ruy Mauro arrived in Mexico to a community of Brazilian academics and comrades, many of whom were also experiencing exile for the first time. The author would later see his four short years in Mexico as the period in which he came into his own professionally (Marini 2005b: 83). Here, he would craft a conceptual framework regarding the nature and implications of the Brazilian coup, with key themes and concepts that would enter the framework of Marxist dependency theory. Marini would also produce texts that attempt to analyze the pushback against the Brazilian dictatorship by the organized left and student movement, in tandem with his own growing relationship with radical student movements in Brazil and Mexico.

In Mexico, the author's name starts established at several institutions, within the intellectual circles, and in the last two years of his stay, internationally. Marini becomes affiliated to the Centre for International Studies at the Colégio de México, as part of the editorial board of its flagship journal, *Foro Internacional*, and from 1966, head of international relations. In 1968, Marini also joins the Centre for Latin America Studies (Centro de Estudios Latino-Americanos) at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (National Autonomous University of Mexico, UNAM). He would remain associated with CELA until the end of his life, with former students there becoming associates in discussions and investigation (Marini 2005b: 69-77; Ceceña 2005). Finally, he takes on the position of educator at Conescal (the Regional Centre of School Constructions for Latin America, an organ of UNESCO, the OAS and Mexican government) in mid-1966, where he broadens his study of Latin American social and economic reality including the budding regional student movement (Marini 2005b: pp.77-78). He would remain affiliated with the Colégio de México and Conescal until November 1969, when he was forced into exile for a second time.

On the Origins of the Brazilian Dictatorship

Beginning with a report he would deliver to a meeting of POLOP Central Committee in 1965 (Marini 2005b: 70), in Mexico, the author starts work on a series of texts in which he attempts to come to terms with the roots of the Brazilian coup and its startling aftermath: a new "total economic-political scheme" aimed at resolving the economic crisis and class struggle through recourse to a state formation that "put a definitive stamp of approval on the fusion of military and big capital interests," and a new political economy that Marini labelled subimperialism, "the form which dependent capitalism assumes upon reaching the stage of monopolies and finance capital" (Marini 1972b: 15). Several texts would be gathered in his first book, *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* (Underdevelopment and Revolution), originally published in 1969 by the newly formed Editorial Siglo XXI (Marini 1974). However, his painstaking analysis of the movement of Brazilian capitalism and class struggle would continue to evolve afterwards with the regime itself.

Initially, the author's objective was to counter the prevailing line that laid blame for the coup at the feet of US imperialism alone ("a foreign body ... to the internal logic of

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Brazilian life”), erasing the interests, strategy and culpability of the Brazilian bourgeoisie (Marini 2005b: 69). In ‘La dialéctica del desarrollo capitalista en Brasil’ (initially published in the Mexican journal *Cuadernos Americanos* in 1966, later reissued in expanded form in *Subdesarrollo y Revolución*), he instead positions the 1964 rupture in a new interpretation of Brazilian development throughout its modern era (Marini 2005b: 72; cf. Chilcote 2018: ch.4). Starting from the 1937 populist dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas, the ‘Estado Novo’ or New State, the dominant reading of this period usually located the roots of Brazilian underdevelopment in two elements: a structurally dualist economy, riven between modern industry and a still backward and semi-feudal agrarian system; and a class structure dominated by the traditional oligarchy and US imperialism that left an incipient industrial bourgeoisie at the margins. A year into the military regime, this line (largely associated with the PCB and left nationalists) thus looked forward to the resumption of a bourgeois democratic revolution that mirrored the rise of the national bourgeoisie in the classical industrial revolutions, which would be won through a united front of the bourgeoisie and working classes.

For Marini (1966), however, this approach ignores the actual role played by larger fractions of industrial and finance capital and sections of the petit bourgeoisie in the 1964 coup. More fundamentally, it elides the major developments of the modern era which show that, far from an antagonistic divide between the backward and modern sectors of the economy, industrialization actually occurred on the basis of complementary interests between industrial capital and the traditional rural oligarchy; a holding pattern of compromise, however fractious at times. This pattern would rupture in the 1950s, beginning with a fall in key agricultural exports and their prices on international markets, which reduced the foreign exchange available to purchase capital goods necessary for industry (Marini 1965); and continuous bottlenecks in the sale of commodities (particularly durable goods, produced by monopoly sectors) due to the limited size of the domestic market (in other words, a crisis of realization) (Marini 1972b: 15-16).

In the same decade, any opportunity for the bourgeoisie to act more autonomously in pursuit of national development was undermined by a shift in US imperialism, with the penetration of US direct investment in key sectors of manufacturing (Marini 1966). Rather than alleviating the social contradictions inherent in the system, the introduction of new technology in the late 1950s only sharpened the crisis faced by workers, by unleashing a new cycle of the general law of accumulation (Marx 1990: ch.25); an increase of labor displaced from the production in industrial sectors dominated by big capital on the heels of higher productivity and widespread impoverishment. Meanwhile, a similar process of mechanization and a fall in exports results in a similar swell of labor displaced from the rural sector. With surplus labor unable to be absorbed either in the countryside or urban centres, the crisis drives mass struggles in both, with the Peasant Leagues demanding agrarian reform, and in the cities, trade unions demanding wage increases to help workers cope with inflation and food shortages.

The industrial bourgeoisie would attempt to manage these pressures under and through three different administrations, culminating in the government of João Goulart (1961-64) attempted to revive the “bourgeois-worker united front, of Varguista inspiration, this time back by the communists” (Marini 1966). Each attempt would fail. With the

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

intensification of class conflict and the rate of profit threatened, the bourgeoisie opted for a military solution in the April 1964 coup.

Subimperialism

In a 1965 article published in *Monthly Review*, Marini attempts to place the coup in its external context, by exploring its economic and class-related drivers at a regional level, but also by attempting to make sense of the regime's somewhat autonomous economic and military ambitions in the region under the rubric of US imperialism; a strategy he would call subimperialism (Marini 1965; 2005b: 72). The origins of this strategy could be located in key developments in the post-war period which, in their mature and interrelated phase, become elements of 'integration' with imperialism: within the United States, the growth of capital surpluses which the domestic economy is unable to absorb which then are turned outwards, and the accompanying growth of monopolies; within Brazil, the dynamics discussed above; and finally, within the region more generally. In the latter context, Marini points to the increasing integration of military ideology, aid, training and support at a regional level. This integration exemplifies what the Brazilian geopolitical ideologue General Golbery do Couto e Silva had termed the 'loyal bargain' (*barganha leal*), or the doctrine of continental integration, which suggests a Brazilian acquiescence to the terms of the US National Security Doctrine.⁴⁰ Here,

Brazil cannot escape North American influence ... no alternative remains but to 'consciously accept the mission of associated ourselves with the policy of the United States in the South Atlantic.' The counterpart of this 'conscious choice' would be the recognition by the United States that 'the quasi-monopoly of rule in that area should be exercised by Brazil exclusively' (Marini 1965: 20).

In this context, for example, Brazilian troops would take part in the US intervention against the progressive revolutionary nationalist government of Colonel Francisco Caamaño in 1965 (Keen & Haynes 2009: 309). However, Marini balks at the suggestion that the coup had relegated Brazil to being a vassal of the United States. "What we have, in reality, is the evolution of the Brazilian bourgeoisie toward the conscious acceptance of its integration with North American imperialism, an evolution resulting from the very logic of the economic and political dynamics of Brazil" (Marini 1965: 21). In other words, far from being simply driven by geopolitical ideology and ambition, the roots of this strategy return to the structural contradictions – or the irrational or peculiar character – of Brazilian dependent capitalism, which sets it apart from classical industrial development: that it is unable to create the domestic markets it requires, tending towards pauperization of the majority of

⁴⁰ The latter saw the reach of the new US national security apparatus and its domestic war against communist 'subversion' to the rest of the western hemisphere through the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro (1947), which sanctioned "collaboration with the United States in a global anticommunist strategy, to the extent of justifying military intervention in any country threatened or conquered by 'communist penetration'" (Keen & Haynes 2009: 309).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Brazilians, even to the point of strangling its further capitalist expansion; or to be able to control its technological progress (Marini 1966).

In this context, building on the concept of antagonistic cooperation,⁴¹ Marini argues that the bourgeoisie has opted to pursue a strategy of subimperialism in the region to compensate for the limits to capital accumulation imposed by this very same pact with US imperialism, as well as by the antiquated agrarian system. Subimperialism acts to compensate for these tendencies by seeking out regional markets for Brazilian industrial exports (including the products of a growing military-industrial complex), but in a way that complements the expansion of US multinationals rather than directly competing with them (Garcia & Sá 2018: 388).

However, rather than resolving the structural contradictions that produced dependent conditions in Brazil, the policy only reproduces them. Instead of redistributing the income from these activities to buoy the living standards and purchasing power of its own working class, the subimperialist pact also sees the entry and domination of (mostly US) monopoly capital in key industrial sectors and the creation, in part through state terror and repression, of conditions to generate extraordinary profits which are shared by the larger fractions of the Brazilian and imperialist bourgeoisies. Thus, “foreign capital is provided with the internal conditions for expanding investment and profits in Brazil in return for access to advanced technology and the world market controlled by the monopolies of the developed countries” (Kay 1989: 148). While the productive apparatus of the industrial sectors in question sees a rise in the organic composition of capital, it does so to a perverse effect (Garcia & Sá 2018: 388). Throughout the years of the so-called ‘Brazilian miracle’ (from 1968 onward, coinciding with the intensification of state terror), wage suppression and the absorption of small and medium firms contribute to the further concentration of income and the subsequent development, firstly, of a consumer market for high-end luxury products aimed at the middle and upper classes, and secondly, the production of capital and durable consumer goods consumed by the state itself (i.e., to upgrade military armaments and for use in infrastructure and megaprojects). Both of these developments are deliberately, and even monstrously in the author’s own words, ill-fitted to the consumer needs of the masses (Marini 1972b). In this way, subimperialism (“imperialism without the generalized capitalist transformation of the economy”) and superexploitation are seen to be deeply linked (Marini 1966).

In this way, the author challenges another popular prediction regarding the unviability of development under the dictatorship: the pastoralization thesis of economist Celso Furtado, one of the most prominent proponents of structuralism in Brazil (Garcia & Sá 2018: 387). Furtado suggested that domination of foreign capital would lead to the

⁴¹ Seabra (2020) examines the play of this concept in ‘A Socialist Programme for Brazil,’ issued by POLOP in September 1967. Coined by the German Marxist August Thalheimer, the term refers to a dynamic in the imperialist system during but also following the two world wars; “a cooperation aimed at the conservation of the system and which has its basis in the very process of capital centralization, and which does not eliminate the antagonisms inherent in the imperialist world. Cooperation prevails and will prevail over antagonisms” (POLOP, in Reis Filho & Ferreira da Sé 1985, pp.91-2). For POLOP, this is also what has bound the national bourgeoisies of underdeveloped countries to those of imperialist countries, in order to “ensure the continuity of imperialist exploitation after the withdrawal of colonial armies” (ibid., p.93; see Seabra 2020: 668-9).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

stagnation of import-substituting industrialization, displacing national savings to the countryside, and so, forcing the country to return to its former role as an exporter of primarily agricultural goods. Marini's position was rather that "the dictatorship would correspond to the domination of big national and foreign capital and propel the economy to a higher stage of capitalist development," but would do so by deepening the contradictions already present in the system (Marini 2005b: 75).

Marini (1969: parts III, IV) concludes that it is on the basis of this reading that the character of the coming Brazilian revolution comes into view. Beyond its economic dimensions, the subimperialist pact will only lead to increasing collaboration with imperialism to counter its inevitable response: the mass backlash to dictatorship and superexploitation, which itself will take on continental and revolutionary dimensions. "The union of the popular movements of Brazil and the rest of Latin America, that is to say the internationalization of the Latin American revolution, is thus the counterpart to the process of imperialist integration, inaugurated in its new phase by the Brazilian military coup" (Marini 1965: 29).

Marini's analysis of subimperialism and the Brazilian dictatorship would resonate with intellectuals in the Southern Cone who were living under authoritarian conditions installed by their own 'integrated bourgeoisies', namely in Argentina and Uruguay (Marini 2005b: 71-2), feeding the increasingly clandestine Marxist debate on the phenomenon. *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* (1974) enjoyed a wide readership throughout the 1970s, although the author also felt it to be somewhat out of date by the following decade (Marini 2005b: 82). Marini's 1972 article published in *Monthly Review*, which the author noted was one of the few texts published in this period to examine the challenges faced by the revolutionary left from the inside, would be included as the final chapter starting with its fifth edition, "Towards the Continental Revolution." The welcome that the volume received more generally was down to three factors, from the author's point of view: the novelty of its concepts, which would soon become "crystallized in the theory of dependency;" its novel methodology, "which sought to use Marxism in a create way in order to build an understanding of the national process in Latin America;" and ultimately, "its political audacity, which broke with the timorous and aseptic academicism that was the norm for the studies of this nature" (ibid.). Although not always with the author's permission, the book was translated to French, Italian and Portuguese, with an English edition planned by Penguin Press but abandoned for reasons Marini never found out. Predictably, reception in Brazil was blocked by the dictatorship, as entire shipments of the book were destroyed.⁴²

With the Student Movements of 1968

⁴² It would only see publication in its entirety in 2012, in a series intending to recapture the classic volumes of critical Latin American thought (including Marxist dependency theory) of this period, the Coleção Pátria Grande, coordinated by Nildo Ouriques at the Institute of Latin American Studies (IELA) at the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (Marini 2012). See <https://iela.ufsc.br/colecao-patria-grande>, accessed 27 August 2021.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

It is also in this period that the effects of Ruy Mauro's work as a professor and his relationship with his students and militants from the region's burgeoning student movements appear in his writing. Initially, in efforts to synthesize his own approach to Latin American history and development which, he writes, he began to contemplate during his time as a student in France. In 1966, the author took on the leadership of a course in international relations at UNAM, only to become vexed at the degree to which the existing curriculum relied on the experiences of developed countries, which he writes often "suffered from an elitist paternalism" (Marini 2005b: 73-4). Marini turned to study the region's development and history in a systematic way combining, as he would increasingly do in his written work, global frameworks with country-specific study, couching specific foreign policy issues in their socioeconomic contexts.

In this period, the author began to accompany the growing student movement in Brazil with some enthusiasm. He met Cláudio Colombani soon after his arrival; an engineering student from São Paulo, who impressed upon the author "how great the revolt was against the reformism and accommodation of the PCB direction amongst young people" (Marini 2005b: 68-69). A few years later, he would also meet a series of young student leaders who had been released from prison under the dictatorship and granted asylum in Mexico. This group included Vladimir Palmeira, one of the leaders of the March of One Hundred Thousand against the dictatorship in 1968. From these young people, Marini would learn that his analysis of the Brazilian coup had been circulated in a clandestine way by a group to which he himself had been affiliated some years earlier, the Metropolitan Union of Students in Rio de Janeiro (Marini 2005b: 70-1, 80-81).

Meanwhile, Mexican workers and students were attempting to remake the very foundations of their country. Starting in the late 1950s, workers from a variety of categories (teachers, oil workers, mine workers, electrical workers and most notably railway workers) responded to the deep inequalities generated by the government policy known as development stabilization with a series of mass mobilizations, only to face a state crackdown in 1959. While strike actions diminished in the years that followed, trade unions continued to campaign against contract violations, for the recognition of new unions and collective agreements, for union democracy, and crucially, within the state-controlled or corporatist union structures throughout the new decade (Ortega & Solís de Alba 2012).

Over the same period, from 1956 onwards, the student movement starts to build on university campuses throughout the country, with calls for "the democratization of their centres of study, the expansion of their popular character and university reform; and on the other hand, against the anti-popular administration of the state governments of Guerrero, Puebla, Michoacán, Sonora and Tabasco, in the main" (Ortega & Solís de Alba 2012: 21-22). A year and a half following Marini's arrival, students at UNAM would force the university rector, Ignacio Chávez Sánchez, to resign and the internal security forces to be removed from campus. Mirroring the shift to increasingly autonomous forms of organization and ideological clarity that characterized student movements elsewhere in the region (Marini 1970), Mexican students also managed to wrest control of the student societies away from affiliates of the ruling party, the PRI, in response to state interference in the constitutionally-guaranteed autonomy of the university (Keen & Haynes 2009: 336). By early 1968, in the midst of the "systematic and often brutal repression of mass movements, particularly of the

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

working class,” student organizations created spaces of national convergence (e.g., the Consejo Estudiantil Universitario and Central Nacional de Estudiantes Democráticos), coming together around calls for the democratization of not only higher education, but the political system and economy more generally, and created spaces of national convergence (Marini 1970: 9; Ortega & Solís de Alba 2012: 23).

In a survey of such movements throughout Latin America, Marini (1970) looks to common structural factors and experiences in the region’s education system to explain the rise of student militancy. The article charts the explosion of student enrollment in education systems plagued by stagnating (or, in the case of Brazil under the dictatorship, falling) investment; systems which were only poorly fitted to the development of the productive forces of the countries in question (p.5). To this, the government’s only response (spurred by “North American intervention in university life,” channeled through USAID, BID, the OAS, Pentagon and private foundations) was to threaten privatization, which Marini interpreted as “an attempt to disarticulate one of the best organized and most militant sectors of the population” (p.7). He went on to account for the radicalization and increasingly mass character of the student movements, including in Mexico, in this way:

...students are slowly becoming aware of the fact that their university-level demands cannot find solutions in the economic picture in which they live and that, even if some demands were to be met, they would not solve their professional problems. The struggle for structural change thus imposes itself as a necessity to the student and leads him to occupy more and more firmly the terrain of the class struggle (p.8).

Recognizing the need for deep social transformation, unity with urban workers thus became a strategic imperative for the Mexican student movement. Its efforts to create a united front with workers around their demands were met with silence from state-controlled union centrals, but grew nonetheless “to the extent in which the movement gained a presence in the streets, in the factories and working class neighbourhoods” (Ortega & Solís de Alba 2012: 24), which played a crucial role in mobilizing public opinion against the regime (Marini 1970: 9). By August, most schools and faculties of UNAM and the professor’s union led by Félix Barro had joined those of the National Polytechnic Institute (IPN), juridical worker unions, hospital workers, electrician union and distance education workers. The active participation of union members, branches and federations swelled over the following month, taking the form of “marches and student brigades, the formation of workers’ struggle committees [comités de lucha] and some attempts to carry out solidarity work stoppages in workplaces” (p.25). “The student organization must necessarily conclude in the popular organization that, by opposing the obstacles that hinder the historical development of Mexico, will turn into reality the slogan of our movement: Democratic Freedoms.” (Consejo Nacional de Huelga, “Manifiesto a la nación ‘2 de octubre’,” in Ortega & Solís de Alba 2012: 26).

Marini joins CELA on an invitation from Leopoldo Zea to deliver a course on Brazilian history in 1968. The course took off in popularity, drawing leftist students from throughout the university including leaders of the student movement. On their request, Marini delivered a seminar on the first volume of Marx’s *Capital* in his own time, at his home,

drawing together both students and younger faculty members from UNAM and the Colégio de México (Marini 2005b: 77). Reflecting the pressure they were facing, some students joked that he might have to deliver the seminar in prison at some point. These discussions with released political prisoners, including Vladimir Palmeira, and with particular encouragement from Cláudio Colombani, would inform Marini's decision to bring his writings on the Brazilian coup together in *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* in his final months in Mexico.

In May of the same year, Marini contributed an article on the tactics, organization and programme of the Brazilian movement to *El Día*, an establishment newspaper, which appeared months later in August, soon after an upsurge in the student and popular movement that "shook the Mexican establishment to its foundations and became one of the most important points of rupture in the country's history" (Marini 2005b: 78). From the perspective of Marini's own security, the timing was unfortunate. The author came under increasing pressure, including through surveillance and wiretapping. In an attempt to get ahead of the situation, the author opted to set up a meeting with the Undersecretary of the Interior. The official suggested in no uncertain terms that otherwise "good Mexican youth" now in the streets had been poisoned against their own country by foreign agitators – amongst whom he charged Marini himself. In this context, it was mildly suggested that Marini's choice to leave the country would be taken as a "sign of collaboration." The teacher reluctantly began to prepare for a second exile. While direct pressure from the Mexican state ebbed and flowed in the following weeks, the author recalls becoming aware of the degree of collusion between the PRI government and the Brazilian dictatorship, which manifest in an overt effort to block the ability of already exiled Brazilian dissidents to congregate in yet another location (Marini 2005b: 79-80).

On the evening of October 2nd, 1968, an unarmed student protest in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas, in Tlatelolco district of the capital, was attacked with a hail of bullets by the National Army, on orders from President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz and then-Interior Minister, Luís Echeverría. Over the course of the night, a still-unknown number of youth, student leaders and workers (estimated to be in the hundreds) would be murdered or disappeared, and over a thousand more arrested (Keen & Haynes 2009: 336). The event unleashed a wave of repression, signalling the escalation of the PRI's dirty war against the forces of popular resistance, backed solidly by the US State Department.⁴³ The movement would carry on an additional three months following the massacre, entering a period of reflection which would only reinforce the need to expand the movement's reach and forms of struggle to a mass movement.

Following the massacre in October, the author's situation in Mexico became untenable. But as a former student of Marini would later reflect, as he was forced into exile for a second time, he joined a New Left set for a new decade of struggle.

⁴³ Kate Doyle (ed.). 2003. *Tlatelolco Massacre: U.S. Documents on Mexico and the Events of 1968*. National Security Archive Electronic Briefing Book 99. Available: <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB99/>, accessed 16 July 2021.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

The student revolt of 1968 ... really revolutionized relations between society and the political system, and was a critical point in the cultural battle against conservatism of certain countries of Latin America. From the student movement of 1968 emerged new ways of understanding and relating to politics, with culture and with knowledge, which provoked (and provokes) significant consequences yesterday and today. The discussions with Ruy addressed all of this as a way to put the world puzzle back together again from a Latin American perspective, always with the idea that Latin America did not have a passive existence, but rather its own capacity that manifested itself in the shaping of its specificities (Ceceña 2005: 292)

4. Second Exile: Chile 1969–1973

Yo pisaré las calles nuevamente
de lo que fue Santiago ensangrentada
y en una hermosa plaza liberada
me detendré a llorar por los ausentes.

...

Retornarán los libros las canciones
que quemaron las manos asesinas.
Renacerá mi pueblo de su ruina
y pagarán su culpa los traidores.

De Yo pisaré las calles nuevamente,
escrito por Pablo Milanés en memoria de
Miguel Enríquez, fundador del MIR, tras su asesinato por
policía secreta, la DINA, en 1974

I will step on the streets again
of what was bloody Santiago
and in a beautiful liberated square
I will stop to cry for the absent ones.

...

Books will bring back the songs
that burned the murderous hands.
My people will be reborn from their ruin
and the traitors will pay for their guilt.

From Yo pisaré las calles nuevamente,
written by Pablo Milanés in memory of
Miguel Enríquez, founder of the MIR,
killed by the DINA secret police in 1974

Ruy Mauro Marini had been forced to leave Mexico without official documents, and it was Theotonio dos Santos and Vânia Bambirra who would facilitate his entrance visa (not least of which by appealing to the then-senator Salvador Allende) and be at the airport to greet him, in November 1969 (Kay 2019; Bambirra 2005). Beyond these ties, the author's adjustment in Chile was facilitated by the growing awareness of his work amongst the Chilean left, notably younger militants. In the span of a mere four years in Chile, Marini would publish his most celebrated works and take part in a vibrant collective space in which the main contours of Marxist dependency theory would unfold. Furthermore, he would test some of these ideas out in practice, helping to define the revolutionary line of the most fervent debates of the day, regarding how to bring about an end of dependency. Although we cannot know if Marini would have accepted this in its entirety, dos Santos would later say of this period,

We took these ideas abroad in search of a new theory of dependency. The theory of dependency was never an academic theory. It was a political endeavor, an attempt to develop a noncommunist revolutionary theory (in Chilcote 2018: 185).

Marini took up residence in the old industrial city of Concepción in March 1970, to start a position at the Instituto Central de Sociología at the University of Concepción. The author was aided in this regard by Nelson Gutiérrez, a former student leader at the university. Gutiérrez had been exposed to Marini's ideas through his contact with Brazilians in the city and would later comment, "I knew that the professor ... would help me to resolve my daily concern, summed up in the phrase: without theory, no revolutionary action is possible" (Gutiérrez 2005: 264). For Marini, the decision was overtly a political one: "if the level of politicization was high in Santiago [with the formation of the Unidad Popular coalition], it would acquire explosive connotations" in Concepción (Marini 2005b: 85). In August 1965, the city had also witnessed the creation of the Revolutionary Left Movement (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria, or MIR). The MIR was established in a "Congress of Revolutionary Unity" by members of Revolutionary Marxist Vanguard, a youth federation of the Socialist Party (who had been expelled a year earlier), several student organizations (including the Student Federation of the Universidad de Concepción), trade unionists from

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

the Central Unica de Trabajadores (CUT) and Agrupación Nacional de Empleados Fiscales (ANEF), as well as militants from a variety of ideological camps, including Trotskyists, dissident communists including those shaped by the Sino-Soviet split, dissident Christians, left-libertarians and anarcho-syndicalists (Cabieses 2018).

While rooted in a different conjuncture and setting, the MIR was born from many of the same questions as those that had given rise to POLOP, sharing many of the latter's theoretical and strategic orientations. Its founding documents in 1965 identify Chile as a semi-colonial country, its economy characterized by unequal and combined development, with its most modern industrial sectors subordinated to imperialist interests. The tendency condemned the Chilean ruling class for its inability to fulfil even the basic tasks of a democratic bourgeoisie after 150 years of independence, including national liberation, agrarian reform, and the liquidation of remaining traces of the country's semi-feudal past. It concluded that the contradictions of the Chilean system would end inevitably in fascism ("Declaración de Principios", September 1965). For the MIR, it followed that the strategy of the traditional parties of the Chilean left, based on reforming the capitalist system through collaboration with the bourgeoisie, in the search for a "peaceful path" to socialism, would only waste the hopes of workers. The tendency placed itself squarely in the socialist camp, noting the degree to which revolutionary challenges to imperialism were now worldwide, including in countries deemed to be without a supposedly 'mature' proletariat. As such, the MIR argued the revolutionary process in Chile must reflect its unique class formation, and be built on an alliance between the "national majority of workers, peasants and impoverished middle sectors" of the cities and countryside ("Programa...").⁴⁴

The MIR was led by a dynamic set of young leaders including medical doctors Miguel Enríquez Espinosa and Bautista Van Schowen, medical student Luciano Cruz (all of whom would be killed during the Pinochet assault or assassinated in the aftermath by the DINA), and later by Nelson Gutiérrez. In response to increasing repression by the regime of Eduardo Frei Montalva (1964-1970), the tendency experienced an internal break with its Trotskyist members, redefining itself entirely as a Marxist-Leninist organization in 1967, with Miguel Enríquez as general secretary. In 1969, it took the decision to turn to the organization of armed struggle through mass organizations of students, the rural and urban poor, and working classes (see Gutiérrez 2005: 266). This move that would see it banned by the Frei regime and further, the capture and torture of several leaders. A fervent process of clandestine construction over 5 years was cut short, unfinished, by the 1973 coup (Cabieses 2018).

Marini joined the MIR soon after his arrival in Chile, and would remain one of its key intellectual drivers until the end of his life (Gutiérrez 2005). Social bases of the group included several trade unions in Concepción and the surrounding region, including in the traditional coal mining communes (small cities) of Lota and Coronel, the historical birthplace of the Chilean Communist Party. In this setting, Marini worked with the MIR's political

⁴⁴ See the "Declaración de Principios" (September 1965) and "Programa del Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario (MIR de Chile) (15 August 1965), both available at the Archivo MIR-Chile, hosted by the Centro Estudios Miguel Enríquez (CEME): https://www.archivochile.com/Archivo_Mir/Mir_libros_sobre/html/mir_archivo.html, accessed 7 July 2021.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

commission to shape its theoretical line and praxis, but also in the political formation of its cadres. Nelson Gutiérrez (2005) recalls that

His life had been transformed in such an intense way that it led him to an incessant pedagogical practice, both in classes and in meetings with militants and worker leaders from the coal mines of Lota, Coronel and Arauco, the weavers of Tomé, the leather and shoe industry of Concepción, and with high school and university student leaders from the south of the country (p.264).

Between the university and his militancy, it was in this context that Marini's students and comrades began to call him the *maestro*, or sage (Gutiérrez 2005).⁴⁵

Nonetheless, in September 1970, *the author relocated to Santiago to take up a position as senior researcher at the Centre of Socio-economic Studies (CESO) at the University of Chile; in part, once again, at the urging of dos Santos, in part responding to the political exigencies of the moment, following Allende's presidential win* (Kay 2019; Olave 2015: 13). *From its founding in 1965 to its peak in 1972, CESO became a point of convergence for a generation of Marxists and left intellectuals, attracting people from throughout the region as well as from Europe and North America* (Marini 2005b: 87-88; Kay 2019: 614). *Here, Marini found community with a "vast colony" of exiled Brazilians, among them dos Santos and Bambilra (who had arrived in mid-1966), Andre Gunder Frank and his wife Marta Fuentes, as well as amongst the new Chilean left* (Marini 2005b: 84-85). Colleagues included Tomás Vasconi, Marta Harnecker, Julio López Gallardo, as well as younger colleagues including Jaime Osorio (a student leader from the Faculty of Sociology), Orlando Caputo, Roberto Pizarro, Álvaro Briones, Antonio Sánchez, Guillermo Labarca, and Brazilians Marco Aurelio García and Emir Sader, amongst others. By the same time, Brazilians Maria da Conceição Tavares and Fernando Henrique Cardoso had joined CEPAL and the Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES), respectively, both with headquarters in Santiago as well (Marini 2005b: *ibid.*; Gutiérrez 2005: 267; Ferreira, Osorio & Luce 2012: 9).

For Bambilra (1973), CESO was the "most consistent effort to develop a 'Marxist theory of dependency'" (in Kay 1989: 139; cf. Dal Rosso & Seabra 2017). In mid-1967, Theotonio dos Santos established a project to examine dependency in different national contexts in the region, and in 1968 report, produced one of the first definitions of "dependency" as such (Kay 2019: 605). In fact, work coming out of this project would, in turn, influence the program of Unidad Popular (UP). Despite their rich collaboration within CESO, it is also interesting to note that dos Santos, Bambilra and Marini begin to move in different directions politically in this moment (cf. Kay 2019: 615); while all three engaged in a critique of the ideas coming out of CEPAL, the former two joined the UP coalition in an effort to influence its programme ("a major stimulus to intellectual work, a fantastic laboratory for analyzing social change and revolution"), while the latter maintained a *mirista* position and critical distance from the UP (Kay 2019: 610, 621).

⁴⁵ Email exchange with Jaime Osorio, 4 July 2021.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

La Dialéctica de la Dependencia

While he had gathered preliminary notes in what would become known as his ‘red book’ (in reality, a red folder) since 1966, it was in the context of a 1971 seminar series that the seeds of Marini’s seminal work, *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, begin to come together. The series was part of the Dependent Capitalism section at CESO which the author directed. Judging from his memories of the period, we can surmise the role that dialogue with his students and colleagues, both here (including Emir Sader, Andre Gunder Frank, Tomás Vasconi, Marco Aurelio Garcia, Cristián Sepúlveda and Jaime Osorio)⁴⁶ and earlier in Mexico, played in the elaboration of the text (Marini 2005b: 89-90). The essay began as a background text for a seminar called “Marxist theory and Latin American reality,” which would

begin with Marx’s *Capital*. The seminar was to include Marx’s political works, but, given [the 1973 coup], it did not go beyond the first part. It was not a simple reading of the book but rather – drawing on the Mexican experience – [an effort] to take it as a guiding thread for a discussion on how to apply its categories, principles and laws to the study of Latin America (Marini 2005b: 89).

Featuring an historical bent that the author was ultimately unsatisfied with, this first version of the text was lost when Marini’s red book was destroyed in the “genocidal and incendiary fury” of a military raid on the day of the coup, September 11th, 1973 (Gutiérrez 2005: 268). However, prior to this, an incomplete version of the text was also published by CESO as a working paper, in the very first volume of its house journal *Sociedad y Desarrollo*, in March 1972 (Marini 1972a).⁴⁷ This version would feature in the introduction to the book, subsequently published with *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* in Italian by Einaudi in 1974 (Marini 2005b: 90; Prado, in Marini 2012: 25).

The essay begins with a critique of the tendency of orthodox Marxists of the time to reduce all Third World social formations to the catch-all abstraction of ‘pre-capitalism’, by noting that the Latin American colonial economy had emerged in “tight consonance” with emergent European capitalism and world system, initially in its contributions of raw materials and precious minerals, which made mercantile trade and banking in Europe possible (Marini 1973a: 16-9). By the mid-19th century, its integration with the world market shifted to the primary export model (initially in Brazil and Chile, before becoming generalized to the region), which “appeared as the process and result of the transition to capitalism, and ... the form that this capitalism assumed...” in the periphery (Marini 2005b: 91). Taking issue with the scope of Gunder Frank’s study of the ‘development of underdevelopment,’ Marini stresses that the dependency of this era is not the same as the relations of subordination that developed under the colonial or mercantile system. He notes that the challenge of his theoretical task “is precisely in capturing this originality and, above all, in discerning the moment in which the originality implies a change in quality” (p.19).

⁴⁶ Email exchange with Jaime Osorio, 26 September 2021.

⁴⁷ This early version is also interesting due to the inclusion, on the final page, of an abstract (again, reflecting an early version of the author’s argument) in English.

As such, he defines dependency as “a relation of subordination between formally independent nations, in which context the relations of production of the subordinated nations are modified or recreated to ensure the expanded reproduction of dependency” (p.18). Beginning from trade and circulation, Marini charts this process by examining the unequal exchange that tends to result from

... transactions between nations that exchange different kinds of goods, such as manufactures and raw materials –, the mere fact that some produce commodities that the rest do not, or that they cannot produce as easily, allows the former to evade the law of value; that is to sell its products at prices higher than their value, thus creating an unequal exchange (Marini 1973a: 34).

Over time, commodities of the dependent economy (primary products) are sold on world markets at prices lower than their value, effecting a transfer of value from the dependent economy to the metropole, in the exchange for the latter’s more technologically advanced manufactured goods. This, in turn, remedies the tendency of the rate of profit in the metropole, resulting from its higher organic composition (p.27).

Crucially, this exchange brings about a qualitative shift in the productive relations (or in a word, development) of the dependent economy and metropole,⁴⁸ respectively, but in highly divergent ways. In the mid-19th century, while cheapened raw materials acquired from Latin America feed technological improvements to the labor process in English industry, cheapened foodstuffs lower the cost of social reproduction for the English worker. In this way, the region contributes to the dramatic uptick in the productivity of the English working class, marking a shift of emphasis from accumulation centred on the production of absolute surplus value to accumulation centred on that of relative surplus value and the second wave of the industrial revolution (generally, starting in the 1840s). However, in order to meet this heightened demand and to compensate for the surplus value lost through unequal exchange, the Latin American oligarchy resorts, not to a similar transformation of the technical bases of production, but to the superexploitation of labor power.

We see that the problem posed by unequal exchange for Latin America is not entirely that of having to counteract the transfer of value it implies, but

⁴⁸ To varying degrees, given the position of the British metropole in the matrix of similarly exploitative relations with other parts of its formal and informal empire. It is interesting to note the coincidence of Britain’s reliance on the proceeds (foodstuffs and raw materials) of labor superexploitation from a social formation whose productive apparatus was still centred on racialized and enslaved labor (Brazil, which would only see the abolition of slavery in 1888) at the very moment it was vociferously declaring an end to its reliance on enslaved labor in its own colonies in the Caribbean. This mirrors the outsourcing of culpability for superexploitation, poor and unhealthy working conditions, union busting, human rights violations, environmental damage and GHG emissions in global production chains today, where the great centers of outgoing investment (including from these still ‘green and pleasant lands’) likewise claim to be the standard bearers on these very issues. Coming back to the period of concern for Marini, the interconnections between superexploitation of labor powers at different nodes of the imperialist division of labor of this period have yet to be mapped.

rather of compensating for the loss of surplus value, and that, unable to impede it at the level of market relations, the reaction of the dependent economy is to compensate for it in the sphere of internal production (Marini 1973a: 38).

This compensation occurs through mechanisms associated with relative and absolute surplus value: increasing the intensity of labor through greater rates of exploitation, rather than the development of the worker's productive capacity; the prolongation of the working day, specifically of surplus labor time; but also crucially, by reducing the consumption fund of the worker below its normal level, so that part of the necessary fund of the worker also becomes a fund of accumulation (Marini 1973a: 38-40). This is the author's definition of superexploitation.

This demand, the value transfers it implies, and the superexploitation that the local bourgeoisies elect to apply to make up for the loss, underpin the dominance of labor-intensive mono-production in the plantations and mines of the region (Marini 2005b: 91), removing any incentive for the development of the productive apparatus in a generalized way. The reproduction of super-exploitation in successive moments hinders the transition from absolute to relative surplus value in underdeveloped countries, reproducing dependent capitalism.

In dependent nations, the option to resort to superexploitation sets up a second point of divergence with the metropole; here, regarding the circuit of capital. In the case of England, the circuit of capital reinforces and allows the integrity of a nation-state (only in this respect, given its existence as an imperialist nation); in the case of dependent economies, this integrity is occluded in so far as the sale of commodities are continually turned to the outside, something that can be sustained so long as a "sufficiently large surplus population exists" (Kay 1989: 146).⁴⁹ In other words, where English workers were paid enough to be able to consume some of the very use values they produced without sacrificing the rate of profit, in Latin America, this dual function (worker-consumer) is pulled apart. Working class consumption is so limited that the worker is not expected or indeed able to aid in the realization of capital investment, which occurs instead through external markets. In this sense, even when it occurs, "industrialization does not fundamentally alter the model of capital accumulation in Latin America, which continues to rely on the over-exploitation of labour" (Kay 1989: *ibid.*).⁵⁰

⁴⁹ On the surface, this resonates with CEPAL's thesis on structural dualism, described by Garcia and Sá (2018) here: "[Dualism] ... refers to a notion according to which a great heterogeneity in the productive apparatus would give rise to 'two worlds' and 'historical times' coexisting simultaneously – the modernized elite, on the one hand, and the backward masses, especially the rural ones, on the other, without, however, merging into an integrated market, nor indeed constituting *one* society proper. The closure of this social gap – the major goal of [CEPAL] development policies – would ultimately depend on a broad reform of the world economy as a whole that would end the core periphery structure, and thus enable capitalism to flourish in countries, such as Brazil, that were historically under privileged by the international division of labour" (p.387). However, Marini's work to this date illustrates the imbrication of the so-called backward agrarian structure and industries and, perhaps more importantly, the degree to which the former remains profitable and often connected (i.e., through backward linkages) with the more dynamic sectors of industry. This context continues to characterize the interior of Brazil until today.

⁵⁰ Kay opts for the word *over-exploitation* in his translation of *superexplotación*. In our view, superexploitation

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Marini's conclusions are as audacious as his preceding analysis. He argues that the points of divergence that characterize the dependent economy are equally germane to the capitalist mode of production, in that "underdevelopment is the other face of development" (Marini 2005b: 90; see Osorio, "Dialectics, Superexploitation, and Dependency: Notes on *The Dialectics of Dependency*", *this volume*). "Capitalism *sui generis*," as a mode of production, only makes sense if one considers the system as a whole, as much at the national level as (principally) at the international level (Marini 1973a: 14). And responding directly to the unearned axioms of modernization theory, greater engagement with this international division of labor, now in its second century, will only deepen dependency, if the productive relations underpinning it are not destroyed (Marini 1973a: 18).⁵¹

The Marini-Cardoso Debate

The publication of *La Dialéctica de la dependencia* marks the beginning of a period in which Marini's ideas begin to receive critical engagement, either in the form of deep study or of attacks (Marini 2005b: 132). The most notorious critique came from Fernando Henrique Cardoso in a series of interventions between 1972 and, with José Serra, 1978 (Cardoso 1974, Serra & Cardoso 1978, Cardoso & Faletto 1979).⁵² Marini responds to the authors assertions and certainly misconceptions in a series of texts (Marini 1973b, 1974a, 1978, 2005b) which also articulate his thesis on dependency as a particular form of capitalist development and on superexploitation all the more sharply. The debate between Cardoso and Marini expresses key tensions between the Marxist and structuralist approaches on the question of dependency and the kinds of development that were possible in Latin America. But what also matters politically in this period was the diverging implications of each for political strategy (Kay 1989: 127). The context and significance of the advent of *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, and the implications of its thesis both for Marxist theory and political strategies in the region, is addressed in depth in the chapter by Jaime Osorio, so I will not go into it in detail here.

Cardoso's initial critique (originally published in 1972, reproduced in 1974) of *Dialéctica de la dependencia* coincided with the development of his own model of 'associated dependent development', which refers to the main agents of the new "tripod" structure fostered since the Kubitschek administration of the late 1950s: state enterprises, multinational corporations and the local businesses associated to each (Cardoso 1974: 31). Cardoso takes issue with the supposedly novelty of the concept of dependency, and rejects the notion that the search for "intermediate relations and articulations" represented a methodological advance in the theorization of dependent development (Cardoso 1973 in Chilcote 2018: 201-2). More generally, together with Enzo Faletto (Cardoso & Faletto 1979),

is a more accurate rendering.

⁵¹ The context and significance of the advent of *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, and the implications of its thesis both for Marxist theory and political strategies in the region, is addressed in depth in the chapter by Jaime Osorio.

⁵² The most in-depth treatment of the debate in English can be found in Kay (1989: ch.6) but see Prado (2005) for the way in which the debate was shaped and manipulated institutionally by Cardoso in Brazil to create a *pensée unique* surrounding dependency. See Marini (2005b: 92) for the author's last word on the subject.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

the author rejects any effort to come up with a general theory or “law of dependency,” given the degree to which dependency points to social relations which are by definition dependent and contingent. Instead, Cardoso claims to focus on *contingent* structures of dependency; structures that can be overcome to allow a degree of capital accumulation by local bourgeoisies, even realization is reliant on foreign markets and luxury consumption by the same class.

Cardoso and Serra’s 1978 essay takes more precise and extensive aim at the terms of Marini’s thesis on dependency, superexploitation and subimperialism. They begin by taking issue with Marini’s formulation of unequal exchange, and his suggestion that deteriorating terms of trade in favour of advanced economies will necessarily lead to fall in the rate of profit in the periphery, leading local bourgeoisies to compensate by resorting to superexploitation (Serra & Cardoso 1978: 22-26). They likewise dismiss the author’s intermediate category of subimperialism, which they suggest is not the necessary result of problems of capital realization (the inability to sell commodities to realize their value due to a limited domestic market), bizarrely using data precisely from the intensification of the dictatorship from 1969 to 1975, which saw the increased consumption of durable consumer goods and capital goods by the middle and upper class, and the public sector and military government, rather than the masses, to make their case (pp.36-9). Moving on to their main objection, Serra and Cardoso argue that Marini has overstated the significance of labor superexploitation, and underplayed the significance of relative surplus value in dependent capitalist accumulation (pp.42-5). Marini does so, they allege, by ignoring the role that technological advances have played in lowering the cost of constant capital and in raising labor productivity (and so, the rate of profit), both in the historical development of capitalism and in the sectors producing durable consumer goods dominated by monopoly capital in Brazil since the late 1950s. In this setting, industrialization on the footing established by advanced economies is possible in a dependent country like Brazil, and on the eve of a controlled return to democracy, the political possibilities extend well beyond Marini’s binary of absolute repression (or fascism) or socialism, an analysis couched in economism (p.53).

Marini initially responded to Cardoso’s critiques of this argument in *En torno a Dialéctica de la dependencia* in 1973 (1973b, chapter XX of this volume), as well as in the 1974 preface to the fifth edition of *Subdesarrollo y Revolución* (1974a). The former essay was initially intended to be a preface to the book-length publication of *Dialéctica* but, as the author explains in its first lines, he found it difficult to introduce an essay that was itself intended to be an introduction to a new research agenda and the conclusions he had reached to date (Marini 1973b: 81). Marini would also reflect on the entire debate in his 1990 memoir (Marini 2005b). There, he notes that Cardoso’s earliest response to *Dialéctica* took the initial article issued by CESO as its source material (Marini 1972a; Cardoso 1974), an incomplete version that did not include his analysis of the industrialization process (Marini 2005b: 92). This, in turn, led to a series of misinterpretations of Marini’s arguments which would be reproduced time and again, not least by Cardoso himself.

Much of Marini’s rebuttal involves a tacit defence of his apparent points of departure from the standard universalizing interpretations of Marx’s theory of capitalist development and labor theory of value; a universalizing assumption that Cardoso and his

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

co-authors reproduce by insisting that capitalism operates and unfolds in broadly the same manner as it does in advanced economies. In part, Marini defends his analysis by challenging Cardoso on the question of which phenomena (the contradictory reproduction of seemingly older forms of exploitation, the expansion of the relative surplus population even in times of growth) are actually essential to the capitalist mode of production as it develops on a global scale (Marini 1973: 91-5); and secondly, in his use of Marx's own methodology to do so, even when he challenges Marxist orthodoxy in the process (cf. Higginbottom 2012, *forthcoming*). As Osorio ("Dialectics, Superexploitation, and Dependency...", *this volume*) argues,

It was necessary to re-create Marxism, but not to repeat Marx, because the unprecedented problem was to substantiate the existence of a new modality of capitalism and to define its developmental trends within the framework of this relationships with the capitalist world system. That is what Marini's book ... offers to theory and Marxism. No more, and no less. (p.114)

As such, in the 1973 post-script to *Dialéctica*, Marini (1973b) clarifies the extent to which he adapted the dialectical methodology that Marx used to construct the three volumes of *Capital*. He cites Marx's caveat that, "In theory, we assume that the laws of the capitalist mode of production develop in their pure form. In reality, this is only an approximation" (p.82), before reminding us that his objective in the original essay was to attempt to "determine the *specific laws* by which the dependent economy is governed" in Latin America, which evolved "in the wider context of the laws of development of the system as a whole" (p.99).

Marini answers Cardoso's comment (1974, with Serra in 1978) regarding the connection between unequal exchange and superexploitation. He defends his decision to start with circulation and the formative insertion of the Latin American economy in the world system, which mirrors the way that Marx begins *Capital Volume 1*. He then illustrates how – in a world system composed of productive forces which vary significantly in terms of "their respective organic compositions or capital, which in turn point to different forms and degrees of labor exploitation" (p.87) – the heightened demand for food and raw materials by industrialized countries, whose economies are characterized by higher organic composition, is met by the more extensive and intensive use of labor power in dependent ones, which "increases the value of the commodities produced, which simultaneously increases surplus value and profit" (Marini 1973b: 88). The growth of Latin American exports in this period (until the 1870s) in turn drives inward direct investment from the metropole. It is the transfer of profits and surplus value in this second moment (the last quarter of the 19th century)

... to the industrial countries [which] points in the direction of the formation of an average rate of profit at the international level, something that frees exchange from its strict dependence on the value of commodities. In other words, the importance of value as the regulator of international transactions in the previous stage gradually gives way to the primacy of the price of production: the cost of production plus the average profit, which,

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

as we have seen, is less than the surplus value in the case of dependent countries (p.90).

Marini (1978) thus adopts Marx's concept of prices of production in *Capital Volume 3 (Marx 1991)*, extending and modifying it to work at the *international* intersection of capitalist commodity production and circulation. He argues that Cardoso and Serra have misunderstood the dialectical relation between prices and value as they operate at the international level.

The only thing that circulation can do is to *compare* the socially-necessary labor time for the production of commodities, that is, to compare the values of these; on this basis, the commercial price of each is determined, that is, a *relation of prices* is established between them, which, however much it may vary by the action of supply and/or demand, *revolves around the comparison of values*. ... The only effect that can be derived from the international mobility of labor power has to do with the *prices of production*, by favoring, on that plane, the formation of average profit (Marini 1978: 64-65).

It is under the form of international market prices that there is a transfer of value from Latin America to Europe; an unequal exchange of different socially necessary labor times. For this reason, his critics have failed to recognize the significance of mechanisms that exist (again, embedded in the normal functioning of the market) that make it necessary to resort to superexploitation, from the perspective of the subordinated bourgeoisies, particularly of agricultural and mining economies.

Marini (1973b) also takes a moment to clarify the definition of superexploitation, addressing what he would later contend was the most damaging error made by Cardoso's 1972 essay: the conflation of superexploitation with absolute surplus value (Cardoso 1974: 28, 32; Marini 2005b: 92; see also Luce 2018: ch.3). The author refers to his original outline of superexploitation, which includes two elements that Cardoso has omitted: that superexploitation may involve greater intensification of labor, and that it necessarily

... affects the two labor times within the working day and not only surplus labor time, as is the case with absolute surplus value. For all these reasons, superexploitation is defined more by the greater exploitation of the worker's physical strength, as opposed to the exploitation resulting from increasing his productivity, and tends to be expressed in the fact that labor power is remunerated below its real value (Marini 1973b: 92-3).

Cardoso (1974, 1978 with Serra) also mischaracterizes Marini's argument regarding relative surplus value, suggesting that he argues that increases to labor productivity are precluded in dependent economies (Marini 2005b: 93). Marini responds that the task is rather to understand the character that relative surplus value takes in the dependent economy (Marini 1973b: 100); a question he answered in *Dialéctica* by examining "the tendency of the dependent economy to block the transfer of productivity gains to prices, fixing as extraordinary surplus value what could become relative surplus value" (Marini

2005b: 93). It is also a matter of determining the significance of all higher forms of exploitation in efforts to characterize a given dependent social formation as a whole:

...what my essay seeks to show is, first, that *capitalist production, by developing the productive capacity of labor, does not eliminate but rather accentuates the greater exploitation of the worker*, and secondly, that *combinations of forms of capitalist exploitation are carried out unequally throughout the system, and give rise to different social formations according to the predominance of a given form*" (Marini 1973b: 93, italics in the original).

...the greater or lesser occurrence of forms of exploitation and the specific form they take *qualitatively modify the way in which the laws of movement of the system, and in particular the general law of capital accumulation, take shape in each context* (p.98).

Venturing into a clearly ontological divergence between himself and Cardoso, Marini suggests that

superexploitation does not correspond to a survival of primitive modes of capital accumulation, but *is something inherent to it that grows in correlation with the development of the productive capacity of labor*. To assume the opposite is the equivalent of accepting that capitalism, as it approaches its pure model, becomes and increasingly less exploitative system... (Marini 1973b: 98).⁵³

In his later response to Serra and Cardoso (Marini 1978: 95-98), the author also clearly shows the degree to which superexploitation has increased under the Brazilian dictatorship: with an increase to the suppression of trade unions and political repression, the explosion of the industrial reserve army, and the enforced suppression of real wages by the regime; and in the labor process itself, with the lengthening of the workday and the intensification of labor, which Serra and Cardoso neglect to mention as a concrete phenomenon (p.97). Rather, "[t]he working class itself is to blame for the fact that its skin is being torn off its back" (p.98).⁵⁴

⁵³ While Marini is taking issue with the 'marginal mass' thesis of the 1970s in this passage, his comments here may also appear to resonate with Trotsky's observations on 'uneven and combined development', which has enjoyed a recent revival. On the issue of the significance of this axiom for Marxist dependency theorists, including Marini, I agree with Luce's (2018) judgement here: "However, we understand the latter [uneven and combined development] to be on a more general level of abstraction, considering the unequal pace in the historical process for a wide range of events. In contrast, the uneven development examined by TMD [inspired by Lenin] is based primarily on the historical unfolding of the law of value and on the differentiation of social-economic formations, in the context of the formation of the world market and the integration of productive systems, giving rise to specific historical phenomena. This gives rise to tendential laws specific to the dependent economy, originally discovered by the TMD, and which are a sharpened expression of the general laws of capital, under negatively determined tendencies as the *predominant moment*" (p.11, ft.3, emphasis in the original).

⁵⁴ There are other elements of Marini's response in this debate, namely regarding subimperialism and the nature of the state. Please see Kay (1989: 168-9), who does justice to these themes.

Coming back to Cardoso's thesis, what is clear in this exchange is the bourgeois positionality of Cardoso and his co-authors, with the very definition of associated dependent development being reduced to local accumulation – where “the national bourgeoisie and foreign capital were compatible and dependency and development no longer antagonistic” (Rieznick in Chilcote 2018: 201) – rather than the forms and degrees of the exploitation of the working class that made it possible, as highlighted by Marini, Bamberra and dos Santos. Marini would refer to this somewhat mischievously in his memoir, noting that he originally thought to call his extensive and acerbic response to the pair (Marini 1978), “Why I am proud of my bourgeoisie.” More forcefully, he would condemn Cardoso as an apologist for the dictatorship who conflated a violent model of accumulation and superexploitation installed by the military regime with the Brazilian bourgeois revolution (Marini 1974: viii).

Several interesting issues follow from the debate. The most damaging thing to note is that neither Marini's original text nor his responses to Cardoso and Serra would be published in Brazil until decades later.⁵⁵ By contrast, Cardoso and Serra successfully institutionalizes their reformist position in Brazilian political sociology in their work at the prestigious Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (Cebap) research unit in São Paulo, of which Cardoso was a co-founder, which operated as an intellectual space for the democratic opposition under the dictatorship (Chilcote 2018: 157-62). Prado (2015) lays out the precise ways in which Cardoso's line in particular came form a *pensée unique* through which generations of students and militants would understand the debate around Latin American dependency theory; a line which openly asserted and then reproduced misrepresentations and even falsehoods regarding the Marxist strand, particularly in the work of Marini but also of Theotonio dos Santos and Andre Gunder Frank,⁵⁶ which were left unanswered and uncorrected in the polemical vacuum in Brazil due to their exile.

Cardoso's views on the Marxist side of dependency theory, although untenable, were repeated in universities and, what is even worse, in centres of political formation. This process of establishing a ‘single line of thought’ about the dependency controversy also saw the contribution of several important intellectuals, giving rise to a genuine ‘intellectual inertia’ that has started to be broken in recent years (Prado 2015: 135).

While Marini's seminal essay is only now being published in English, Cardoso's responses to it and the elaboration of his own Weberian approach to dependency were also published in English soon after their original publication dates, becoming one of the main

⁵⁵ Only Marini's final monograph would be published upon its completion in his country and language of birth (Marini 1992; see also Ouriques 2012, Prado 2015).

⁵⁶ Where Kay (2019) discusses the lengthy polemic waged between dos Santos and Cardoso in the new century, Prado (2015) observes that Cardoso's attacks on TMD did not include the only woman amongst the founders of this strand, Vânia Bamberra, who was very much part of this debate (p.128, ft.2). Meanwhile, an online archive of Bamberra's work (including her efforts to include the earliest applications of gender to the analysis of dependency) is maintained by the Laboratório de Estudos sobre Marx e a Teoria Marxista da Dependência (Lemarx-TMD/ESS) at the Universidade Federal of Rio de Janeiro and the Núcleo de Pesquisa em História at the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul: <http://www.ufrgs.br/vaniabamberra>.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

touchstones in the conversation surrounding dependency in the English-speaking North as well (e.g., Cardoso 1977, Cardoso & Faletto 1979). While several pieces of conjunctural analysis by Marini would be published in English in publications like *Monthly Review*, *Contemporary Marxism* (now *Social Justice*), *NACLA's Report on the Americas*, and *Latin American Perspectives* (Marini would also sit on its editorial board) in the United States, an English version of his theoretical masterwork planned by Penguin never materialized (Marini 2005b: 93; Chilcote 2018: 203). Similar to Prado and Ourique's evaluation of the *de facto* boycott of Marini's work in Brazil, the lack of access to his work in English limited the scope of debate surrounding dependency to its reformist and structuralist strands (Chilcote 2018: 200-1), arguably making it easier to discount in the early years of neoliberalism.⁵⁷

A second interesting thing to note are the points of break and continuity, both theoretically and politically, in the paths of his interlocutors. Both Cardoso and Serra came to distance themselves from any earlier influence by Marxism (see Chilcote 2018: 141, particularly ft.7 by Bambirra) and became key figures in Brazil's shift to neoliberalism following the end of its dictatorship; Cardoso in the role of Finance Minister under Itamar Franco (1993-94) and as President (1994-2002), and Serra in several cabinet roles in Cardoso's administrations and as Governor of the state of São Paulo (2007-2010), both for the Brazilian Social Democracy Party (PSDB). Here, the degree to which Cardoso's misreading of Marini's theoretical argument in *Dialéctica* would be carried into the neoliberal moment, revived by Cardoso in his first presidential mandate to justify the introduction of neoliberal reforms (Codas 1996; cf. Chilcote 2018: 200, comment from Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira). In 1996, he argued that the trade liberalization and privatizations slated in this package would drive the modernization of the technical bases of production, increasing productivity, which the now-clearly former Marxist boldly argued would signal the shift from absolute to relative surplus value. What was actually unleashed: a new cycle of the general law of accumulation involving the displacement of millions of workers from the formal labor process and heightened rates of exploitation (including superexploitation) for those able to remain. Old errors die hard, especially when one is in power and under no compunction to account for them.

Coming back to *Dialéctica de la dependencia* itself, however, even the incomplete version of the essay was warmly received and inspiring a generation of students, prompting Marini to attempt to complete the book and see it published. This would happen in 1973, together with the author's first response to Cardoso, with Editorial Era in Mexico. Over the next few years, although Marini hesitated to authorize publication of an essay that he reflected a line of research he had yet to exhaust, *Dialéctica* would see several authorized

⁵⁷ See for example, Weeks and Dore's 1979 critique of the dependency thesis, in which they ignore much of the complexity of Marini's framework (e.g., the significance of internal class relations, the movement from circulation to production) to charge him with being an underconsumptionist. They use Lenin and Bukharin's response to the Narodnik's articulation of underconsumptionism, arguing that "there is in fact, no 'realization problem' (problem in converting surplus value into profit) since the major portion of the realization of value occurs not through workers' (or even capitalists') consumption ... but through the productive consumption of the means of production" (Weeks & Dore, 1979: 69-70). While the same essay levels a critique of the 'eclecticism' of Cardoso, this argument also echoes his own that the significance of Brazilian workers as consumers mattered less to accumulation, given the increased consumption of capital and durable consumer goods by the State.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

editions (two Portuguese editions, Centelha 1976, Ulmeiro 1981 as well as German in 1974 and Dutch in 1976), and several more unauthorized versions (in France, Argentina, Spain and Portugal) (Marini 2005b: 93, 105). In this period, the work “went on to be discussed, questioned and – almost always passionately and even in bad faith – attacked.” But, he stresses: “I did not live through this experience alone, which took place in the context of the critique of dependency theory which began in 1974” (Marini 2005b: 132).

Debating Unidad Popular

As Marini’s political work within the MIR took him throughout Chile, the author also plays a role in the debate taking shape between the MIR and the new government of Salvador Allende and the Unidad Popular. With Marta Harnecker, he participated in the founding of a journal, *Chile Hoy*, the objective of which was to work through the roots of opposition between the two projects – both ostensibly geared towards achieving socialism and an end to dependency – and moving towards greater unity (Marini 2005b: 94). Similarly, Marini edited the few editions of a second journal, *Marxismo y Revolución*, the group was able to produce, and several analytical pieces which would later be published as a book, as *El reformismo y la contrarrevolución. Estudios sobre Chile* (Marini 1976b). By the eve of the coup, the current was set to being producing a newspaper, *El Rebelde*, from its own small publishing house. In this way, the MIR managed to project itself into the mass media and national debate, and to gather critical intellectuals and cultural workers from Chile and other countries inspired by the Chilean experience (Gutiérrez 2005: 269).

In “El desarrollo industrial dependiente y la crisis del sistema de dominación” an essay published soon after the electoral victory of UP in November 1970, Marini (1976a) takes issue with the class strategy underlying the Chilean road to socialism, which he characterizes as an attempt (in part) to attract or neutralize key layers of the petty bourgeoisie. He does so by placing the strategy in the context of industrial development in Chile over the previous decade, and by rejecting the argument that the strategy of national development (i.e., the first phase of import-substituting industrialization) has been ‘exhausted’. This argument, he suggests, misses key dynamics over the previous decade: specifically, that industrial production has been increasingly divorced from the consumption needs (and indeed, means to consume) of the masses in favour of luxury consumption (and the production of intermediate goods in order to facilitate this) geared towards the highest levels of society.

This was accompanied by a high degree of concentration and, subsequently, monopolization, in the more dynamic industrial sectors. He usefully distinguishes between the former (“a process of monopolization characterized by the expansion of a given capital, based on its own expanded reproduction”), typical of a period of expansion, and the latter (a process of “centralization in which a given capital absorbs other already formed capitals”), typical of declining periods with retracting periods of growth. He also notes the monopolization of Chilean industry in the post-war period occurred not just at the hands of foreign investors (which only began to grow from 1960-67, and did so rapidly, through FDI and shareholder participation) but was particular to the largest firms. It was the largest firms (whether national or foreign) who were able to not only monopolize a given market,

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

but to also access credit, and more importantly, to dominate the distribution of surplus value. As such firms tended to rely on advanced technology but also to increase rates of exploitation in the labor process, generating an extraordinary rate of surplus value, and thus of profits. Ultimately, Marini argues that a strategy that downplays the role of industrial workers, and invests rather in a layer of the petit bourgeoisie (e.g., small and medium enterprises squeezed out by the process of monopolization) that may, in the last instance, revert to a defence of bourgeois state, will only aggravate the political crisis. Arguably, this analysis proved to be correct.

Marini (2005b) would later say of his short time in Chile that it “corresponded to ... my arrival to maturity both on an intellectual and political level” (p.99). On the first day of the coup, Marini’s small apartment in Providencia was raided, a place where *miristas*, exiles and friends had taken to gathering (Gutiérrez 2005: 270). With several friends, the author took refuge in the Panamanian embassy.

The events that marked [the end of exile] – the military coup of September 11th, the experience of state terrorism to its highest degree, the days passed in the Panamanian embassy, where close to 200 people made a disciplined and solidarity effort to co-exist in a small apartment, under the noise of bombs and gunfire – were experienced naturally, as contingencies of a process whose historical significance was perfectly clear to me ... (Marini 2005b: 99).

With rumours flying that he had been among the thousands interned in the Estadio Nacional and perhaps that he also been executed, Marini was forced to flee – once more, with little on his person. He speaks warmly of the support he received from friends and comrades in this moment, including from his cleaner, who managed to locate some money. “This was one of the more moving manifestations of solidarity that I received then, on the part of Chileans who were humble, the most conscious and combative” (Marini 2005b: 100). The author left for Panama in mid-October, where he remained until January 1974.

5. Third Exile: Mexico 1974 – 1984

La patria no es el amor	The homeland is not love
La patria no es el cuerpo	The homeland is not the body
La patria son los hijos	The homeland is the children
La patria eres tú	The homeland is you
La patria es el trabajo	The homeland is work
La mano que hace el pan	The hand that makes the bread
El grito valeroso que rompe la cadenas	The courageous cry that breaks chains
La alma de los barrios,	The souls of the barrios
La joven compañera	The young compañera
La muerte tempranera del joven luchador,	The premature death of the young fighter
La madre que los espera loorando con rencor.	The mother who waits for him weeping with bitterness.
Amigo ven	Come, friend
Te voy a dar...	And I will give you
Mi parecer, amiga.	my opinion, friend.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

De Amigo Ven, por León Chávez Teixeira, músico, cineasta y militante del movimiento obrero que hizo la crónica de los movimientos de los años 60

From Amigo Ven, by León Chávez Teixeira, musician, filmmaker and organizer in the labor movement who chronicled the movements of the 1960s

Over the next few months, Marini received several offers of work and efforts to help him get re-established. His own desire was to settle in Argentina, on account of its proximity to Chile, to return once again to Mexico “for sentimental reasons” (Marini 2005b: 100-2). However, the MIR’s political commission asked that the author relocate to Europe, home to the largest solidarity movement outside of Latin America; a political network built in part through personal connections with activists and intellectuals fostered at CESO (Kay 2019: 614; Gutiérrez 2005). At the outset of 1974, Marini moves to Munich to join the Max Planck Institute on an invitation from Otto Kreye, whom he had met earlier in the year at a conference set up by Samir Amin. In Munich, he is able to reconnect with former colleagues from CESO, including Antonio Sánchez, Marcelo García, and Gunder Frank. In September of the same year, Marini also takes on a post as visiting professor at the Centre of Latin American Studies at UNAM, allowing him to return to Mexico City; he would split his time between the two until mid-1976 (Marini 2005b: 103, 105).

In the Aftermath of September 11th

Marini dedicated himself to leading the MIR’s work in the exterior, in a moment in which the military governments allied under Operation Condor were working to track down *miristas* in exile (Marini 2005b: 103-5). Events would expose to the author the extent to which he is being monitored by both the Brazilian regime and the Chilean secret police (the DINA), who were shown to have hatched a plan to capture both Marini and the brother of Miguel Enríquez, Edgardo, who would be disappeared a year later in Argentina. The author nonetheless continues the work he began in Chile, moving regularly throughout Europe and, where possible, Latin America, until the beginning of 1977. He appears as the main speaker in a rally on the first anniversary of the coup in Frankfurt before a crowd of an estimated 300,000 supports. From 1974-79, he edited and wrote regularly for the *Correo de la Resistencia*, the current’s external organ.⁵⁸ The work he accomplished in this period, in the effort to create “an external rear guard that would help to sustain the political work of the front,” now targets of the junta’s death squads and DINA, would shape the MIR’s activities in the exterior until the end of the dictatorship (Gutiérrez 2005: 272).

In 1974, Marini takes part in the foundation of the journal *Cuadernos Políticos*, with a group of young intellectuals that had been themselves formed “in the heat of the movement of 1968” (Marini 2005b: 106). Marini notes the singular role of Neus Espresate, the director of the publishing house that had published *Dialéctica*, Editorial Era, as a member of the editorial committee of the journal. Marini was likewise a member although, hesitant from his previous experience as an intellectual made public in Mexico, it would be two years before he felt secure enough to make this public. He remarks that although the board, whose rich long meetings made it feel more like a working group, was initially on the

⁵⁸ See Marini’s editorials and interviews for *Correo de la Resistencia* here: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/008_correo_resistencia_marini.html (accessed 4 July 2021).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

same page ideologically, it was not long until different tendencies would emerge. Particularly at the hand of Espresate, they would find a way to keep working together. “*Cuadernos* knew how to be a stimulating and flexible organ, which opened space to new ideas and new authors, airing the intellectual climate of the Mexican left” (Marini 2005b: 106).

In the charged atmosphere following the coup, one of the author’s main tasks was to answer the charge that the MIR, having turned to armed mass struggle in the midst of the parliamentary process, was ultimately responsible for the coup. Marini took this on in several texts. One of the most popular, “*Dos estrategias en el proceso chileno,*” appeared in the July-September 1974 edition of *Cuadernos Políticos*, and would later appear as a chapter in *El reformismo y la contrarrevolución. Estudios sobre Chile* (Marini 1976b). Marini’s objective is explain why the MIR maintained its position outside of the UP coalition once Allende took office, rather than joining the (largely Communist Party of Chile, or CPCh) effort to create a “single leadership of the mass movement” that had brought UP to power. He begins by setting out the divergent readings of the political conjuncture by the MIR and CPCh respectively, which in turn would shape their respective and distinctive tactical and strategic projects from 1970 onwards. Given this divergence, Marini argued that there was no objective basis for a united strategy.

Marini specifically focuses on the class composition of the revolutionary bloc of each tendency. The CPCh had maintained its line of class collaboration following Allende’s election, now in an effort to attract and ally the organized sections of the urban and rural working class with middling layers of the bourgeoisie that had been alienated by the new system oriented around big capital. This meant a political dialogue with the very party that had been dislodged by Allende, Frei’s Christian Democratic Party (DC). The MIR, on the other hand, did not see the demands of the popular movement – contradictions in a crisis that had come to a head during the UP’s first year of reforms – as things that could or should be reabsorbed in further compromises with big capital. Despite the fragmentation of the bourgeois camp that had been provoked by the turn in Chile’s dependent development under the Frei government, the very same process had spurred new forms of struggle and organization, which would only grow under Allende. The capitalist penetration into the countryside, and piecemeal agrarian reform initiated under Frei, also sees the rise of mass struggle in the countryside by waged and semi-waged workers excluded from this reform (including Mapuche peasants), which is mirrored by the growing militancy of layers of both unionized and non-unionized workers in the cities, *pobladores* from the peripheral urban communities, and petit bourgeois layers of public sector waged workers.

The divide between the CPCh and the MIR was on the question of how to relate to this camp. Where the CPCh argued that this popular energy had to be subordinated to the UP government in the name of its stability, the MIR held that it wasn’t the institutions and traditions of bourgeois democracy that would ensure the stability of Allende, but this increasingly revolutionary bloc. The MIR’s politics of alliance, with the organized working class “at its centre, should include the broad proletarian and semi-proletarian masses of the city and the countryside, as well as the impoverished layers of the petty bourgeoisie.” Rather than the stabilization of an order anathema to the interests of the popular forces, what was needed was the “development of a mass power [outside of and] alternative to the

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

bourgeois State” (Marini 1974c; see also Gutiérrez 2005: 270). As the Chilean bourgeoisie launched its counter-offensive in mid-1972, it was this bloc that had radicalized in an effort to meet it, with “the advance of revolutionary positions within the masses, not only from the point of view of consciousness, but of their very organization.” In practice, the creation of mass forms of workers’ control over production and distribution, including industrial cordons, factory and supply-side commands, popular warehouses and so on. For the MIR, these were conditions that were not simply conducive to a revolutionary rupture; they were the only way out of the open class warfare that had brought a military-fascistic government (representing the interests of the newly recomposed bourgeois bloc, with the US model of counter-insurgency firmly in the background) to power even months prior to 11 September 1973. The essay does end in a call for revolutionary left unity, but also a warning that the very divergence it charted was in danger of being repeated.

In an editorial in *Correo de la Resistencia*, Marini (1974b) sets out the MIR position a year into the dictatorship. He challenges the reformist contention that the contradictions unleashed by the military junta in its first year would naturally bring about its demise, as the violence and increasing pressure of its economic reforms came to be felt by the popular classes. He points out that the Chilean bourgeoisie had a similar strategy during Allende’s administration, but did not simply passively wait for the “pear to ripen”. Instead, with the active support of US imperialism, it had regrouped across its fragments and engaged in a strategy to “interfere permanently in the facts of everyday life,” culminating in the open class warfare. The MIR thus called for a strategy to actively *make* the regime unviable, through a broad political front to organize mass resistance. The call would be on an agenda to defend the standard of living of the masses, to oppose the squeezing of wages, increased dismissals and unpaid overtime, with the demand for basic democratic freedoms.

Finally, the MIR also backed a strategy that would mirror the continental coordination achieved between military regimes and imperialism, in the form of a Revolutionary Coordinating Junta (Junta de Coordinación Revolucionaria) (Marini 1974b). The Coordination was meant to bring together revolutionary currents particularly from the Southern Cone, many of whose militants had taken refuge in Chile under Allende. The effort drew on support from the international socialist camp but relied mostly on the moral as well as material support of the revolutionary Cuban government (Gutiérrez 2005: 271-72). The JCR became a primary target of Operation Condor, which aimed to effect its “physical liquidation” through coordinated state terror (Cabieses 2018, Dinges 2004).

From 1978-79, the MIR direction opted to return to support the Chilean front, by returning experienced cadres to the country. In this setting but not for the first time, Marini is asked to join the Comité Central. He agrees, Gutiérrez (2005) suggests, out of a sense of “historical and ethical responsibility” (p.273), and returns to the work of political formation that he began in Chile almost ten years earlier, but now, in support of the revolutionary struggles that had erupted in Nicaragua and El Salvador, as well as Peru (Cabieses 2018).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Marini (2005b) would later return to the question of why he eventually rejected the concept of “military fascism,” used in the essay “Dos estrategias en el proceso chileno” (Marini 1974c). He writes that, as the new generation of dictatorship in the region crystallized,

I was convinced that the characterization of the Chilean (and Latin American, more generally) counter-revolution as fascism would mystify the real nature of the process and aim to justify the formation of broad fronts, in which the bourgeoisie would tend to take on a hegemonic role. At the time, it appeared to still be possible to struggle for a politics of alliances that did not imply the subordination of the popular forces to the bourgeoisie, since the left still possessed, locally, the capacity to act in Latin America and was on the rise in Western Europe, Africa and Asia. The defeats that it suffered later lead to the triumph of a formulation of the broad front under bourgeois hegemony, which presided over redemocratization in Latin America during the 1980s... (Marini 2005: 96).

From 1975, Marini also returns to journalism, to write for the daily paper *El Universal* but here too faces censorship (Marini 2005b: 110). In 1977, with Cláudio Colombani, he takes part in the creation of the Center for the Information, Documentation and Analysis of the Workers’ Movement (Centro de Información, Documentación y Análisis del Movimiento Obrero), and acts as its direction from 1977 to 1982. Cidamo was an autonomous entity which would bring together “young and brilliant” researchers, many exiled from the region’s ongoing struggles, to a space of collective reflection and theoretical production, including Chileans Jaime Osorio, Patricia Olave Castillo and Lila Lorenzo (better known by her political alias, Toña), Luis Hernández Palacios, Francisco Pineda and Maribel Gutiérrez from Mexico itself, Antonio Murga (Peruvian-Honduran) and Alberto Spagnolo from Argentina, as well as students and militants particularly from revolutionary movements in Central America (Marini 2005b: 112-3; Kay 2019: 615).

Marini would begin another important line of inquiry, building on the work he had begun in Chile on historical processes of change and socialist revolution, but now motivated by new concerns: the crisis of socialist strategy, and on a related note, the struggle over the terms of the return to democracy, in which the left had not just to contend with the bourgeois imperialist counterrevolution, but increasingly, democratic movements under bourgeois leadership (Marini 1980). Marini takes note of the growing of a section of Latin American intellectuals in European social democracy, which he sees reciprocated in seminars, funding and collaborative projects of European NGOs in the early 1970s; for example, a meeting “between the main forces of the Chilean left, excluding the PC and the MIR, [in which] the political nature of social democracy action was perfectly defined” (Marini 2005b: 102; see also Gutiérrez 2005: 274-5).

His conjunctural texts in the late 1970s offer a supple treatment of the changing nature of the State, and specifically the deliberate substitution of military dictatorships for a limited form of democracy, once the utility of the former to regional patterns of accumulation had run its course (Marini 2005b: 111). He issues several pieces that examines the shift in US policy under the Carter administration from the doctrine of counter-revolution and counter-insurgency developed in order to contain the Cuban

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Revolution, to the promotion of a ‘managed’ transition to a specific and limited form of democracy, which Samuel Huntington referred to as ‘governable democracies’ (Marini 1980).⁵⁹ Rather than the popular form of democracy demanded by mass movements, Marini argued that a new “State of four powers” was taking shape, still representing the bourgeois interests advanced by the dictatorship, but now in a setting where the reconstituted three powers of liberal democracy were joined by a fourth, that of the Armed Forces, which overdetermined the former three. This political formation would allow a space for popular mobilizations unthinkable during the early years of dictatorship to grow, but ultimately, it would also determine the contours of the democratic opening. This thesis irritated people at the seminar of left intellectuals at which it was launched, including Andre Gunder Frank, but ultimately, the author countered that understanding this new expression of bourgeois and imperialist power was essential in the effort to define a new radical strategy to defeat the “state of big capital” (Marini 2005b: *ibid.*; Marini 1980).

The Pattern of Capital Reproduction in Dependent Formations

Also in this period, the extension of the line of research that began with *Dialéctica de la dependencia* would now occur with a growing cohort of researchers and students trained by Marini at the Centro de Ciencias y Humanidades at the Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales at UNAM and, beginning in 1977, postgraduate students at another institution, the Escola Nacional de Economía, where he was a visiting professor. Here, he oversaw the dissertations of students from throughout the region, including that of Jaime Osorio at the Colégio of México, written on the Chilean State (Marini 2005b: 107-110). The author’s analytical work in this period moved in three directions (pp.115-8): examining the cycle of capital at work in the dependent economy (Marini 1979a), the transformation of surplus value into profit (Marini 1979b), and the basis of subimperialism in the late 1970s, discussed earlier.

The article “El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente” (1979a, which included commentary from Héctor Díaz Polanco and Jaime Osorio) examines the three phases in the cycle of reproduction and circulation of capital, as set out in the second volume of *Capital*, in the dependent economy. It observes the extraordinary role that foreign capital places in the first phase of circulation (in the form of the money-commodity, in the form of direct and, from the late 1960s onwards, indirect investment, coupled with commodities in the form of the means of production) and the second (the phase of production, where foreign

⁵⁹ Although less notorious than the role of US soft power in the Chilean dictatorship, the Brazilian experience is no less disquieting. In the early 1970s during his work with the Trilateral Commission, Harvard University’s Samuel Huntington acted as an advisor to the Brazilian dictatorship under Emílio Garrastazu Médici, as well as the South African Apartheid regime, on the issue of what he termed ‘decompression’; how to effect a gradual, controlled return to democracy without destabilizing the political (and presumably, capitalist) order in question (see Huntington 1973). While his role should not be overstated, he would later say that, “[t]he Brazilian transition to democracy was in many respect a masterpiece of obfuscated incrementalism,” and noting the role of a “younger generation of Brazilian political scientists – who, thanks to the Ford Foundation, had been trained during the 1960s at Stanford, UCLA, Harvard, MIT, Michigan and elsewhere – played active roles in developing and articulating ideas that were central to the Brazilian process” (Huntington 1988). In the late 1970s, Huntington would serve as Coordinator of Security Planning for the National Security Council in the Carter administration.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

direct investments see the production of extraordinary surplus value through the payment of “wages inferior to the value of labor power”). Both elements of the latter phase exacerbate the concentration of capital and the distortion of income distribution which, in turn, distorts the realization of capital (which drives the expansion of branches of luxury goods and the transfer of extraordinary profits abroad, in the form of remittances, interest payments on loans, royalties etc.) in the final turn of the cycle. These particularities set the cycle of capital apart from the experience of classical industrial economies.

Written as part of a public competition to secure his promotion to full professor at the Escuela Nacional de Economía, “Plusvalía extraordinaria y acumulación de capital” (published in *Cuadernos Políticos* in 1979) likewise examines recent controversies surrounding the use of schemes of reproduction set out in the final section of *Capital Volume 2* in historical and concrete studies of capitalism in Latin America. He illustrates the “specific purpose that they fulfil in Marx’s theoretical construction - the demonstration of the necessary compatibility of the magnitudes of value produced in the different departments of the economy - and analyze the three premises that have caused so much discussion: a) exclusion from the world market; b) the existence of only two classes; c) the consideration of the degree of labor exploitation as a constant factor” (Marini 2005b: 117). He then turns to examine the effects of variations in the extent of the working day, its intensity and productivity on the relation between value and use-value, and on distribution. The final section of the essay critically examples the treatment of these schema in the work of three contemporary economists. Marini would later write that, while probably amongst the least known of his works, he considered this essay to be “an indispensable complement to the *Dialéctica de la dependencia*, in so far as it expresses the result of investigations that began in Chile, on the effect of labor super-exploitation in the setting of extraordinary surplus value” (Marini 2005b: 117-18).⁶⁰

Marini seemed to take some pleasure, in the heated debate with Cardoso and Serra, that one of their motivations seemed to be “the clear worry of the authors [that] political amnesty was coming closer and that might open the space for me in Brazil” (Marini 2005b: 119). Although political amnesty was granted for those forced into exile by the Brazilian dictatorship in 1979, it would take the author another five years before he could return home indefinitely.

6. At Home Again: Brazil 1984 – 1997

⁶⁰ Analysis of the patterns of capital reproduction in dependent economies would be continued by Jaime Osorio, as well as Mathias Luce, Carla Ferreira, Marisa Silva Amaral, Marcelo Dias Carcanholo (see Ferreira, Osorio & Luce 2012; Luce 2018: ch.2).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

Mulher, você vai gostar:
Tô levando uns amigos pra conversar.
Eles vão com uma fome
Que nem me contem;
Eles vão com uma sede de anteontem.
Salta a cerveja estupidamente
Gelada pr'um batalhão
E vamos botar água no feijão.

Feijoada Completa, de Chico Buarque. A canção é colocada em uma festa a acolher os amigos do exílio e, acima de tudo, gente dos movimentos de massa forçado de sobreviver clandestino – tantas pessoas que é necessário diluir o feijão.

Honey, you'll like this:
I'm bringing some friends around to talk.
They're going with a hunger
they won't even tell me.
They're going with a thirst from the day before yesterday.
Stupidly chugging beer,
ice cold for a battalion
and let's put water in the beans.

Feijoada Completa, by Chico Buarque. The song is set at a party to welcome back friends from exile and, above all, people driven underground from mass movements – so many that it's necessary to water down the beans.

In the final, contemporary section of his memoir, Marini shares some frank (and at times, seemingly painful) reflections, as much on the alienation of exile as on his disquiet regarding the state of Brazilian intellectual and left culture upon his return. He observes the efforts of the Brazilian bourgeoisie to salvage the model of accumulation developed under the dictatorship, now refitted to a neoliberal outlook and economy, despite the turmoil unleashed by the Third World debt crisis that began in Mexico in 1982. More devastating still were the efforts of Brazilian intellectuals, even on the left, to conform to this new orthodoxy, which Marini attributes to the effects of the dictatorship on the intellectual life of universities following the coup: of curricula being censored, the stream of propaganda on mass means of communication, and military interventions on campus that not only removed students and academics but also “mutilated plans for study, and by means of privatization, even degraded the quality of teaching,” using financial resources (extended during the dictatorship through agreements with USAID) to steer students to graduate study in the United States and Europe (p.120). While claiming to “broaden the bases of [Brazil’s] autonomy in the international sphere,” the military’s cultural policy had instead had lead a loss of identity, as the country swung, once again, towards liberal thought (Marini 2005b: 120; see Garcia & Sá 2018: 385, 389-90). Following a visit in the mid-1980s, he reports that Brazil,

despite having had its general movement determined by the same tendencies that ruled Latin America in this period – thus participating in the same process characterized by the swelling of class inequalities, of external dependency and of state terrorism – did so by accentuating its cultural isolation in relation to it and launching itself towards a compulsive consumption of ideas fashionable in the United States and Europe (p.119).

In this setting, he condemned the degree to which left intellectuals had been co-opted into silence and conformity, including those who positioned themselves against the system. Perhaps in a thinly-veiled criticism of Cardoso, amongst others, he notes that

... the closed environment that suffocated the country provide profitable to those who could come and go freely, monopolizing and personalizing ideas that flourished in the intellectual life of the region, adjusting them to the limits set out by the dictatorship. ... In this context, the majority of the Brazilian left collaborated, in a more or less conscious way, with official policy, closing off the road to the diffusion of issues that spurred the Latin

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

American left in the 1970s, marked by political process of great transcendence and concluded by a victorious popular revolution (p.121).

In a moment of democratization brought about in large measure by popular forces, Marini connects the turning away of the intelligentsia from mass social movements with a desire to connect with the international forces of social democracy: European social democratic foundations, US-based research foundations and funders (whether state or private), and cultural institutions funded by churches and Christian Democrats. “[T]he fight to obtain resources coming from these [sources] reconstituted the intellectual elite on totally new bases, without any relation to those – based on political radicalization and on the rise of mass movements – that had sustained them in the 1960s” (Marini 2005b: 122; see also Ouriques 2012: 20-1).

As noted at the outset of this essay, it is also clear that Marini faced considerable political and institutionalized obstacles in his efforts to return to academic life. Dos Santos (2016, in Kay 2019: 619), for example, noted that of all his returning colleagues, it was Marini who was “victim of a systematic boycott” upon his return. Bambilra (2005) attributes the *de facto* ban that he faced in Brazilian academic spaces to the attacks of Cardoso and Serra (p.286). Nonetheless, after several attempts to re-establish himself in Rio de Janeiro were stymied at two institutions for overtly political reasons, Marini was finally reintegrated to the University of Brasília in 1987, where he joined the Department of Political Science and International Relations to teach postgraduate studies. Incredibly, the move sees him reunited with many friends with whom he began, including Bambilra, dos Santos, amongst others (Marini 2005b: 126-7). The author would join efforts to reintegrate other former professors and instructors who had been forced to leave following the 1964 coup, an effort he saw “as repairing one of the many arbitrary actions committed by the dictatorship” (Marini 2005b: 127).

Marini’s research in this period continued a line of investigation he had begun in Mexico, examining the effects of the crisis and the internationalization of capital on the labor process in the 1980s in a variety of countries (Marini 2005b: 113). Now, he turned to examine the performance of key manufacturing sectors in Brazil (particularly the auto sector in the late 80s) under the military’s policy of incentives and export subsidies (p.130). However, he also returned to the now very public debate around income concentration, that he had identified as an element of labor superexploitation in the 1970s. The issue now shaped a major turn in the mass workers struggle of the early 80s, not least of which amongst workers in key industrial sectors. This

led me to the interesting observation that the acceleration of income concentration, which began in the 1960s, lost momentum in the late 1970s and early 1980s, was a result, in my opinion, of the rise of social movements in the country at that time. The strengthening of the bourgeois bloc, in the so-called New Republic, the retraction of productive investments to the benefit of financial speculation and the offensives launched against workers – especially in the economic plans that began in 1986 – reversed, as everything indicates, this tendency (p.129).

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

As important as these investigations may be, the author notes that research in the late 80s left him feeling somewhat alienated from the objectives and concerns of his main line of work. In May 1990, he returned to Rio de Janeiro on sabbatical.

Marini's final monograph, *América Latina: Dependência e integração* (1992a), brought together many of the author's essays of the late 1980s regarding the new contours of dependency under globalization. He begins with an account of the defeat and dispersion of popular movements in the fight for democracy, and the destruction of the class-based opposition to the limited terms of bourgeois democracy that followed. Chapter 2 examines the more recent 'conversion' of Latin America following two decades of crisis in the world economy, through neoliberal policies ("the form and expression of the breakthrough reached in the inter-bourgeois struggles by the modern fraction, allied to the international bourgeoisie," or the sheer imposition of the interests of the latter) and the deep transformation of national economies, not least of which through productive restructuring on the basis of greater specialization and the new ideology of productive efficiency (pp.56-57). The next chapter charts the crisis in Latin American economic thought through this same period, which has culminated in an impasse for progressive forces, who face a choice between neoliberal orthodoxy (in which imperialism is often put "in parentheses") and a return to the national-developmentalism of CEPAL and reformist expressions of dependency thesis. Finally, in a chapter reproduced in English in *Social Justice* (Marini 1992b), the author charts the role of proposals for Latin American unity going back to independence. In the face of competing proposals for regional economic integration at the beginning of the 1990s, *all* with the interests of imperialist centres firmly at their centre, the author looks forward to a kind of integration that resonates with what would fall under the popular slogan, "the integration of the peoples," in the new century.

In this context, Latin America – which faces pressures that tend to tear it apart and open the way for the annexation of its separate pieces – must promote the creation of a broader economic space, one capable of adjusting to the requirements of modern technologies of production. However, this cannot be understood, as it was in the 1960s, as a simple matter of adding relatively dynamic economic sectors that operate as small islands in the ocean of underdevelopment in which the region is submerged. To the contrary, it presupposes the construction of a new economy based on the incorporation of broad sectors of the population as workers and consumers, through a correct targeting of investments, a genuine educational revolution, suppression of the high levels of superexploitation of labor, and, consequently, a better income distribution (p.45).

The effort to understand the convulsions taking place in the world of work would culminate in his two final pieces of note. In "O conceito de trabalho produtivo: nota metodológica," an essay assembled between 1992 and 1997, Marini reviews the development of the concept of "productive labor" and the changing definition of the working class in the work of Marx. This is a very theoretical piece that nonetheless resonated with contemporary debates on the left, with the rise of organized sectors of public sector workers a decade earlier, the weaponization of productivity drives against workers, the flexibilization of contracts and rights, and the broad shifts in employment by

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

sector. He notes that globalization has entailed a diversification of activities, often away from manufacturing to the sphere of circulation and distribution, which make it more difficult to define and measure the working class (Marini 2005c: 202). He spends time on Marx's note that workers involved in the phase of circulation contribute to the profitability of capital by conserving value, and likens this to the role of a variety of workers in the vast services sector (e.g., transport, commerce) that had exploded in the region under globalization. He concludes with a lovely passage, ripe for the decade in which the unity of workers was attacked at every angle.

[T]o define a social class in a given historical moment, it is not enough ... to consider the position that men occupy objectively in the material reproduction of society. Beyond this, it is necessary to consider social and ideological factors that determine their consciousness in relation to the role they believe they play in it. Bearing in mind the criticism that this assertion has suffered, only in the last instance does the economic base determine consciousness. And it does so through concrete social dynamics, that is, through class struggle. In such a way that, under certain circumstances, even workers who are not directly included in the working class or who consider themselves alien to it due to their position in economic reproduction, can identify with its aspirations, incorporating themselves into the labor movement... This is the reason why all the institutions and mechanisms of the political game that characterize bourgeois society ... aim at blocking this perception; they aim at dissolving the latent unity among the workers before it takes shape ... (Marini 2005c: 204-5).

In "Proceso y tendencias de la globalización capitalista" (Marini 1997), the author notes that recourse to the superexploitation of labor has been generalized to the advanced centres of accumulation with the globalized economy (pp.267-8), in which the law of value itself becomes globalized. International capital relies on increasing the productivity of the worker through technological innovation but also, simultaneously, labor superexploitation, which results from the drive for increased productivity and the intensification of labor, both of which allow the individual capitals to capture an extraordinary rate of surplus value and of profit (Marini 1997: 264). No longer limited to competition within a given national market where extraordinary profits tend to be transitory, the heightened competition between large firms in the globalized market implies a permanent search for sources of extraordinary profit produced by these means, wherever they may be. Likening this moment to the introduction of new technology to European productive processes in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the author notes the new technologies will unleash a new round in the general law, increasing the mass of surplus workers and sharpening their pauperization, while "wringing the labor power" of those still left in the formal labor process (pp.267-8). However, Marini ends by arguing that the answer is only as it ever was: that this downward pressure on the worker can only be challenged through the unification of workers struggles the world over, "putting in march a radical democratic revolution" (p.268).

In the summative pages of his memoir, Marini identifies the final turn in the reception of his work and the dependency thesis more generally. On the one hand, he

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

notes the work of younger colleagues to open new theoretical paths in the field of Marxism and dependency theory, despite the crisis posed by the collapse of the Soviet Union. On the other, he also locates the attacks on TMD (starting much earlier, in fact, following the publication of *Dialéctica*) at the heart of the crisis of theory mentioned earlier.

The theoretical poverty of Latin America in the 1980s is, to a large extent, the result of the offensive against dependency theory, which prepared the ground for the region's reintegration into the new world system that was beginning to take shape and which is characterized by hegemonic affirmation, at all levels, of the great centers of capitalism (Marini 2005b: 134).

In this context, and in perhaps the most fulfilling project of his later years, Ruy Mauro Marini took up an invitation to return to Mexico in 1993, to assume the direction of CELA. Here, together with Márgara Millán, the author oversaw the compilation of classical texts in the 20th century social and political thought of Latin America, which would be issued in a four-volume series, *La teoría social latinoamericana* (Marini & Millán 1994). On this theme, I'll give the final word to the author.

... I must conclude by insisting on a peculiar feature of dependency theory, however it may be judged: its decisive contribution to encouraging the study of Latin America by Latin Americans themselves, and its ability, by reversing for the first time the direction of the relations between the region and the great capitalist centers, to make it so that, instead of being on the receiving end, Latin American thought would come to influence the progressive currents of Europe and the United States... (Marini 2005b: 134).

Marini passed away from lymphatic cancer, in Rio de Janeiro, on 5 July, 1997. His legacy lives on.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

References

- Aarão Reis, D. & Ferreira de Sá, J. 1985. Organização Revolucionária Marxista-Política Operária – ORM-POLOP. In *Imagens da Revolução: documentos políticos das organizações clandestinas de esquerda dos anos 1961 a 1971*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Marco Zero.
- Bandeira, Luiz Alberto Moniz. 2001. *O governo João Goulart: as lutas sociais no Brasil – 1961-1964* – 7th edition. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Revan, Editora UnB.
- Cabieses Donoso, Manuel. 2018. Aniversario del Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario (MIR): El honor y la rebeldía. Available: <https://rebellion.org/el-honor-y-la-rebeldia/>, accessed 7 July 2021.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique. 1974. “Notas sobre el estado actual de los estudios sobre dependencia.” Programa de capacitación, Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES), CEPAL. Available: <https://repositorio.cepal.org/handle/11362/34470>, accessed 15 February 2011.
- *Originally published in *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales 4*, in 1972.
1977. “The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States.” *Latin American Research Review 12*(3): 7-24.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique & Enzo Faletto. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Trans. Marjory Mattingly Urquidí. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Ceceña, Ana Esther. 2005. Ruy Mauro Marini: um construtor de caminhos. In R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (eds.), *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, pp. 289-302.
- Chilcote, Ronald H. 2018. *Intellectuals and the Search for National Identity in Twentieth-Century Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Codas, Gustavo. 1996. “Mais-valia e modernidade em FHC.” *Boletim Quinzena* (Centro de Pastoral Vergueiro, São Paulo) 240: 14-17.
- Dal Rosso, Sadi & Raphael Lana Seabra. 2017. A teoria marxista da dependência: papel e lugar das ciências sociais da Universidade de Brasília. *Revista Sociedade e Estado 31*: 1029-1050.
- Dinges, John. 2004. *The Condor Years: how Pinochet and his allies brought terrorism to three continents*. New York: The New Press.
- Ferreira, Carla, Jaime Osorio & Mathias Luce (eds.). 2012. *Padrão de reprodução do capital: contribuições da teoria marxista da dependência*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial.
- Garcia, Ana & Miguel Borba de Sá. 2018. “Brazil: From the margins to the centre?” In H. Veltmeyer & P. Bowles (eds.), *The Essential Guide to Critical Development Studies*. London: Routledge, pp.385-94.
- Gutiérrez Y., Nelson. 2005. Ruy Mauro Marini: perfil de um intelectual revolucionário. In R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (eds.), *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, pp.263-281. Available in Spanish here: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/319_intelectual_revolucionario.html (accessed 2 July 2021).
- Higginbottom, Andy. 2012. “Structure and Essence in *Capital I*: extra surplus-value and the stages of capitalism.” *Journal of Australian Political Economy 70* (summer): 251-70.
- forthcoming. “Superexplotación y *El Capital*: entre el capitalismo actual globalizado y la plusvalía.” In N. Kohan & N. López (eds.), *Marxismos y Resistencias del Sur Global*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO).
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1973. “Approaches to Political Decompression” [mimeo].

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

- 1988. "One Soul at a Time: political science and political reform." *American Political Science Review* 82(1): 3-10.
- Kay, Cristóbal. 2019. "Theotonio Dos Santos (1936-2018): the revolutionary intellectual who pioneered dependency theory." *Development & Change* 51(2): 599-630.
- 1989. *Latin American Theories of Development and Underdevelopment*. London: Routledge.
- Keen, Benjamin & Keith Haynes. 2009. *A History of Latin America – 8th edition*. London: Wadsworth CENGAGE.
- Luce, Mathias Seibel. 2018. *Teoria Marxista da Dependência: problemas e categorias – uma visão histórica*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro. 1965. "Brazilian interdependence and imperialist integration." *Monthly Review* 17(7): 10-23, 26-9.
- 1966. La dialéctica del desarrollo capitalista en Brasil. *Cuadernos Americanos* (Mexico City) 146(3). Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/347_dialectica_brasil.html, accessed 4 September 2020.
- 1970. "Os movimentos estudantis na America Latina." Trans. Jonathan Jaumont. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/pdf/038_movimentos_estududiantis.pdf, accessed 23 July 2018.
- 1971. "La izquierda revolucionaria brasileña y las nuevas condiciones de la lucha de clases." In V. Bambirra (ed.), *Diez Años de Insurrección en América Latina – Tomo II*. Santiago, Chile: Editorial Prensa Latinoamericana S.A.
- 1972a. "Dialéctica de la dependencia: la economía exportadora." *Sociedad & Desarrollo* 1 (enero-marzo): 35-51. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/pdf/024_dialectica_dependencia_1972b.pdf, accessed 21 July 2021.
- 1972b. "Brazilian subimperialism." *Monthly Review* 23(2): 14-24.
- 1973. *Dialéctica de la dependencia*. Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era.
- 1973a. "Dialéctica de la dependencia," in *Dialéctica de la dependencia*. Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era.
- 1973b. "En torno a *Dialéctica de la dependencia*," in *Dialéctica de la dependencia*. Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era.
- 1974a. *Subdesarrollo y Revolución – 5ª edición (corregida y aumentada)*. Mexico City, DF: Siglo XXII Editores. Originally published in 1969.
- 1974b. "El MIR y las tareas de la revolución chilena." *Correo de la Resistencia* (Boletín del MIR en el exterior) No.1, junio. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/pdf/293_correo_de_la_resistencia_01.pdf, accessed 14 April 2021.
- 1974c. "Dos estrategias en el proceso chileno." *Cuadernos Políticos* 1(July-Aug): 18-38.
- 1976a. "El desarrollo industrial dependiente y la crisis del sistema de dominación." In, *El reformismo y la contrrevolución. Estudios sobre Chile*. Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era, pp.55-85. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/040_crisis_sistema.html, accessed 14 April 2021.
- 1976b. *El reformismo y la contrrevolución. Estudios sobre Chile*. Mexico City, DF: Ediciones Era. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/003_libros_marini.html, accessed 27 July 2021.
- 1977. "La acumulación capitalista mundial y el subimperialismo." *Cuadernos Políticos* 12 (April-June): 20-39. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/052_acumulacion_subimperialismo.html, accessed 31 August 2021.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

- 1978. "Las razones del neodesarrollismo (respuesta a F.H. Cardoso & J. Serra)." *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 40 (Número extraordinario): 57-106.
- 1979a. "El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente." In U. Oswald (ed.), *Mercado y dependencia*. Mexico City: Nueva Imagen. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/058_ciclo_capital_dependiente.html, accessed 27 August 2021.
- 1979b. "Plusvalía extraordinaria y acumulación de capital." *Cuadernos Políticos* 20 (April-June): 18-39. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/057_plusvalia_extraordinaria.html, accessed 27 August 2021.
- 1980. "La cuestión del Estado en las luchas de clases en América Latina." Cuaderno 44, Serie Avances de Investigación, CELA, UNAM. Available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/321_estado_america_latina.html, accessed 12 September 2019.
- 1992a. *América Latina. Dependência e integração*. São Paulo: Editora Página Aberta.
- 1992b. "The Paths of Latin American Integration." *Social Justice* 19(4): 34-47.
- 1997. "Proceso y tendencias de la globalización capitalista." In E. Sader & T. dos Santos (coord.), C.E. Martins & Adrián Sotelo Valencia (eds.), *América Latina, dependencia y globalización. Fundamentos conceptuales Ruy Mauro Marini. 2ª edición*. Bogotá, Colombia: CLACSO y Siglo del Hombre Editores. Also available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/089_globalizacion_capitalista.html, accessed 10 November 2010.
- 2005a. Dialética da dependência. In R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (eds.), *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, pp.137-80.
- 2005b. Memória: por Ruy Mauro Marini. In R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (eds.), *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, pp.57-134.
- 2005c. "O conceito de trabalho produtivo: nota metodológica." In R. Traspadini & J.P. Stedile (eds.), *Ruy Mauro Marini – vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, pp.195-205.
- 2012. *Subdesenvolvimento e revolução*. Florianópolis, Brasil: Insular.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro & Carlos Eduardo Martins. 2008. *América Latina, dependencia y globalización. Fundamentos conceptuales Ruy Mauro Marini*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre, CLACSO.
- Marini, Ruy Mauro & Mária Millán (eds). 1994. *La Teoría Social Latinoamericana: textos escogidos. Tomos 1-4*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Martins, Carlos Eduardo. 2008. "Ruy Mauro Marini: marco del pensamiento contemporâneo." In C.E. Martins (ed.), *América Latina, dependencia y globalización. Fundamentos conceptuales Ruy Mauro Marini. 2ª edición*. Bogotá, Colombia: CLACSO y Siglo del Hombre Editores. Also available: http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/pdf/337_dependencia_globalizacion_pp_iniciales.pdf, accessed 10 November 2010.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 1 [The Process of Production of Capital]*. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin Books, 1990.
- *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 3 [The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole]*. Translated by David Fernbach. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume 2 [The Process of Circulation of Capital]*. Translated by David Fernbach. London: Penguin Books, 1992.

DRAFT (2021-02-25). Forthcoming in Ruy Mauro Marini (2022), *The Dialectics of Dependency*, edited by Amanda Latimer and Jaime Osorio. New York: Monthly Review.

- Miranda, Orlando & Pery Falcón (org). 2010. *POLOP: uma trajetória de luta pela organização independente da classe operária no Brasil – 2ª edição*. Salvador, Brazil: Centro de Estudos Victor Meyer.
- Olave, Patricia. 2015. “Ruy Mauro Marini: mínima cronología.” In P. Olave (coord.), *A 40 años de Dialéctica de la dependencia*. Mexico, DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.
- Ortega, Max & Ana Alicia Solís de Alba (2012). *La izquierda mexicana, una historia inacaba*. Mexico DF: Editorial Itaca.
- Osorio, Jaime. 2016a. *Teoría marxista de la dependencia: Historia, fundamentos, debates y contribuciones*. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)-Xochimilco.
- 2016b. “El marxismo latinoamericano y la teoría de la dependencia.” In *Teoría marxista de la dependencia: Historia, fundamentos, debates y contribuciones*. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM)-Xochimilco.
- Ouriques, Nildo. 2012. “Apresentação,” to R.M. Marini, *Subdesenvolvimento e revolução*. Florianópolis: Insular.
- Passa Palavra. 2011. *Extrema-esquerda e desenvolvimento (series)*, part 8/9. Available: <http://passapalavra.info/2011/06/95903/>, accessed 16 March 2015.
- Prado, Fernando Correa. 2015. “Por qué hubo que desconocer a la teoría marxista de la dependencia en Brasil.” In P. Olave (coord.), *A 40 años de Dialéctica de la dependencia*. Mexico, DF: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.
- Seabra, Raphael Lana. 2020. “A vocação política da teoria marxista da dependência: Uma análise da Política Operária.” *Latin American Research Review* 55(4): 662-675.
- Serra, José & Fernando Henrique Cardoso. 1978. “Las desventuras de la dialéctica de la dependencia.” *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 40 (Número extraordinario): 9-55.
- Traspadini, Roberta & João Stedile. 2005. *Cronologia da vida e da obra de Ruy Mauro Marini*. In *Ruy Mauro Marini: vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
- Weeks, John & Elizabeth Dore. 1979. “International exchange and the causes of backwardness.” *Latin American Perspectives* 6(2): 62-87.