

8. Mario Góngora, *Origen de los "inquilinos" de Chile central*, Santiago Editorial Universitaria, 1960; Jean Borde and Mario Góngora, *Evolución de la propiedad rural en el Valle del Puango*, Santiago, Instituto de Sociología de la Universidad de Chile; Sergio Sepúlveda, *El trigo chileno en el mercado mundial*, Santiago Editorial Universitaria, 1959.
9. Woodrow Borah makes depression the centerpiece of his explanation in "New Spain's Century of Depression," *Ibero-Americana*, Berkeley, No. 35, 1951. François Chevalier speaks of turning in upon itself in the most authoritative study of the subject, "La formación de los grandes latifundios en México," Mexico, *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México*, VIII, No. 1, 1956 (translated from the French and recently published by the University of California Press). The data which provide the basis for my contrary interpretation are supplied by these authors themselves. This problem is discussed in my "Con qué modo de producción convierte la gallina maíz en huevos de oro?" *El Gallo Ilustrado*, Suplemento de *El Día*, Mexico, Nos. 175 and 179, October 31 and November 28, 1965; and it is further analyzed in a study of Mexican agriculture under preparation by the author.
10. "Capitalism and the Myth of Feudalism in Brazilian Agriculture," in *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, cited in note 4 above.

Radical Theories of Development: Frank, the Modes of Production School, and Amin

David F. Ruccio and Lawrence H. Simon

I. INTRODUCTION¹

The past four hundred years have witnessed the growth and global expansion of capitalism. In the minds of many, the development of capitalism is synonymous with the expansion of increasingly complex industrial, economic and social structures into ever wider areas of the world. At least since Adam Smith, bourgeois theorists of capitalism have triumphantly heralded this expansion as progressive and unilinear, limited only by the emergence in the twentieth century of socialist regimes. Insofar as there remain in the world today differences in levels of development and national wealth, these can be best overcome, according to orthodox theory, through the further growth of capitalism. The job of neoclassical development economics is to chart this path of growth for the so-called less-developed countries (LDCs).

The view from the left is very different. Where bourgeois theorists see a story of triumph and progress, radical theorists see one of domination and exploitation in both imperialist and neocolonialist modes on the one hand and struggles for independence on the other. Radicals are unanimous in rejecting the orthodox view as theoretically false and politically inadequate.

From afar, this radical approach might be thought to be a unified theoretical position that can be fairly easily differentiated from its orthodox opposite. To some degree this is true. But the left has also generated in the past two decades complex theoretical debates and opposing positions. Radical theorists differ, that is, concerning basic issues in their story. Is the develop-

Manuscript prepared for this volume.

ment of capitalism a necessary, if unfortunate, step in the path of development for any country? Are the economic structures that have developed in the various nations that were formerly colonies best characterized as capitalist? If so, is it capitalism in the same form as developed in Europe and North America, or a new and indigenous form of capitalism? If not, then how should the economies of the LDCs be characterized?

While most radical analyses accept the existence of a world capitalism system, they differ on how to understand the basic dynamic of this system and on how to describe the relations between the more- and less-developed nations within this system. Again, while most, but not all, radical analyses question whether the present economic structures of LDCs will allow development, they differ as to how to characterize the barriers preventing growth. Radical interpretations also disagree as to how much is to be accepted from the theories of Marx and the Marxist tradition. The spectrum runs from what might be considered orthodox Marxist theories of development to theories that, while acknowledging the importance of Marx, in effect reject nearly all of his important claims about the status and development of the colonial world.

In this essay, we analyze three of the theories that have emerged as contending positions on the left. These three—Dependency Theory as formulated by Andre Gunder Frank, the Modes of Production school, and the theory of Samir Amin—by no means exhaust the radical perspective. This article, then, is not a survey of radical theories of development.² Rather, we hope that by looking in depth at three of the alternative views, the issues around which much of the debates have revolved will be clarified.

The three positions that we have chosen are not only major contenders in the debate, but they are related in important ways both historically and conceptually. Theories arise at least partly in reaction to other existing theories that are judged inadequate by those seeking a new departure. The new theory takes up and recasts the challenge of the old one and is best understood in light of this challenge. A theory, then, has at least two tasks: a negative or critical one of arguing against its predecessors, and a positive or constructive one of providing an alternative account of the issues in dispute and of raising new questions. To understand a theory, then, requires placing it in the narrative of the debates in which it arose and developed.

The three theories we have selected have this relationship. Frank's work can be taken as the beginning of the modern debate on the left concerning development.³ The Modes of Production school arises in direct response to what were seen as inadequacies in Frank's theory of underdevelopment. Amin's work represents an attempt to incorporate and synthesize into an encompassing theory of the world capitalist system various of the theoretical insights of Dependency Theory, the Modes of Production position, and more orthodox Marxist treatments.

This essay is intended to be, for the most part, an introduction to these three positions and, thus, is primarily analytic and expository. Its aim is to clarify the structure of the different theories and the issues of contention among them in order to allow those unfamiliar with the material a way into what has become a complex and sophisticated literature.⁴

The essay proceeds as follows. The second section presents Frank's theory of underdevelopment, focusing on the structure of his theoretical model and how it departs from the model of development in neoclassical economics. The third section is a discussion of two critics of Frank, Sanjaya Lall and Robert Brenner. Both Lall and Brenner are sympathetic critics, at least to the extent that they agree with Frank that the neoclassical position must be rejected and a radical alternative provided. Their criticisms illustrate some of the theoretical disagreements that Frank's version of Dependency Theory has generated.

Section four provides an analysis of the Modes of Production school. We analyze this position in terms of three distinguishable approaches: the articulation of modes of production, the colonial or peripheral modes of production, and the internationalization of capital. The focus of the discussion is not only on the basic claims of the three approaches, but also on the interrelations and differences among them. We also situate the overall Modes of Production position in the context of the general debate by analyzing the background and motivation for its emergence. In the fifth section, Amin's theory is presented. We end this section with a brief discussion of a recent reply by Amin to his critics in which points of contact and disagreement between his theory and the others we discuss are further clarified.

II. FRANK AND DEPENDENCY THEORY

Andre Gunder Frank is generally credited as the father of Dependency Theory.⁵ *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, written in the early sixties and published in English in 1967, was the first important statement of the theory.⁶ While Frank certainly had predecessors, as he readily acknowledges, his book can still be used to mark the opening salvo in the debate over Dependency Theory, in part because this book continues to be very influential and is widely cited by both exponents and critics of Dependency Theory. To understand the structure of Frank's argument, however, it is necessary to keep in mind its antecedents, both the positions Frank criticized and the authors upon whom he relied in formulating his own position.

Frank's work grew out of a reaction to both orthodox neoclassical work on development and to the views of certain traditional orthodox Marxists; in particular, those prevalent among the Communist Parties in Latin America. According to Frank, both of these opposing positions shared in certain important regards theoretical theses that were faulty. Positively, Frank's views were

influenced by the structuralist theory of Prebisch and others in Latin America and by the work of the so-called neo-Marxists, especially that of Paul Baran.⁷ In fact, in the theoretical configuration of development economics Dependency Theory is perhaps best located on the continuum somewhere between orthodox structuralist theory and Marxism.

A central thesis shared, according to Frank, by both neoclassical and orthodox Marxist theories of development, and of which he was critical, was that capitalism was a normal and necessary stage of development. This conception of capitalism was part of a more general view of development as occurring through a series of stages. In addition, according to Frank, both of these positions accepted a general dualistic view of so-called Third World societies. Of course, these theses were expressed by each position in very different theoretical language and supported by antithetical theoretical arguments. And, needless to say, the implications each drew from these theses could not be more different. For the neoclassical, capitalism was the end of development, while for the Marxist, it was a necessary, if regrettable, stage to be transcended by socialism. But both agreed that any (nonsocialist) country that needed to develop had to do so within the framework of capitalism, and moreover, that the operations of the capitalist system (of course, conceived differently by the two positions) would lead to higher levels of development in the normal course of things.

In particular, Dependency Theory was defined against the prevailing neoclassical position.⁸ That view starts from the assumption that the economies of all countries can be arranged on a scale from least to most developed (from backward to advanced, or from low-income to high-income, modified perhaps by the degree of oil reserves). Development is taken to be a unilinear process, and all nations have undergone and will continue to undergo essentially the same process. Presumably, according to this approach, at some point in the past all countries were at a stage of economic development that would now be considered undeveloped. For reasons generally taken to be extraneous to the theory, at some point certain countries began to develop economically, while others lagged behind or failed to develop at all. Different levels of development reflect different starting points and different growth rates. The presently undeveloped countries, then, have yet to undergo this process, and they should see their future in the past course of the presently more developed countries.

The orthodox measure of development is the accumulation of wealth (or "use-values"). According to this measure, most countries in the world are obviously relatively undeveloped in comparison to the so-called First World; but, at the same time, most countries have at least sectors of their economies that are relatively developed in comparison to the overall economy.

Neoclassical theory typically understands the condition of less-developed countries in terms of what is called a dualistic economy. According to the theory of dualism, an economy of an undeveloped nation has two sectors,

one traditional and one relatively modern and developed. The two sectors are taken to be largely independent of each other. They may be linked during the transition to modern growth, however, in that the traditional sector may provide labor and an agricultural surplus to the modern sector. The modern sector, moreover, is intertwined in the world capitalist market, while the traditional sector is in effect precapitalist and more or less untouched by capitalist market relations. The dynamic of growth is due to trade and general economic activity, so the process of development of the whole economy is seen to involve the modernization or transformation of the traditional sector so as to bring it into the sphere of the market and thus expose it to the possibilities of trade and development offered by the free market.

Methodologically, neoclassical theory claims to present a model of economic backwardness and development that is based on empirical observation and certain theoretical assumptions about the nature of market activity and economic rationality. The market is taken as the central institutional structure that organizes economic activity and rewards efficiency. Individual actors in the market are taken to be rational, or at least capable of rational decision-making in light of given needs, desires, and possible rewards. Neoclassical theory is essentially methodologically individualist in that it seeks to understand economic development ultimately in terms of the market behaviors of individual actors. Instances where development has failed to occur are explained either in terms of the absence of certain necessary conditions or in terms of local conditions that distort the proper operation of the market mechanism, preventing actors from behaving rationally, or the like.

Frank's original formulation of Dependency Theory begins with a rejection of two of the central theses of this neoclassical dualism. First, Frank rejects the dualist model of the economies of the undeveloped nations in which there are two sectors, only one of which, the more developed, is capitalist. Rather, according to Frank, during the era of European capitalist expansion, most areas, even the geographically remote, were incorporated within the network of capitalist relations. As a result, all parts of the economies of undeveloped nations should be seen to be within the web of capitalism. Not to see them as part of the capitalist system is necessarily to misunderstand their nature and operation. Frank puts this claim forward as an empirical thesis: "A mounting body of evidence suggests, and I am confident that future historical research will confirm, that the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the underdeveloped world."⁹

The second thesis of dualism that Frank rejects is that the present condition of the undeveloped countries is similar to some original, predevelopment stage of the presently developed nations. Rather, Frank asserts, despite certain surface similarities (noncomplexity, nonindustrialization, and/or poverty) between the present condition of the undeveloped nations and the reconstructed past of the now developed nations, neither the colonial past nor

the present of the undeveloped nations resembles in any important respect the past of the developed nations. If we accept the assumption, which Frank seems to accept, that at some point in the past prior to the emergence and expansion of capitalism all countries were more or less the same developmentally (that is, that there was some kind of "original stage" the exact nature of which is never specified by Frank), then it follows that the present condition of the undeveloped nations is not original, primal, or traditional; rather, this state is itself a product of the historical development of capitalism on a world scale.

This point has two important implications. First, there is no single universal trajectory for development that is followed by all nations, for obviously the discrepancy between the more- and less-developed nations today is a result of at least two different developmental paths. Second, if we call the original, predevelopment stage one of underdevelopment, then it is no longer correct to refer to the present condition of the less-developed nations today as undeveloped, since their present condition is itself a product of an historical, developmental sequence. Thus, Frank introduces a new term, "underdeveloped," to characterize the condition of the presently less-developed countries: "The now developed countries were never *under* developed, though they may have been *un* developed."¹⁰

Frank shows little concern for the condition he calls undeveloped. The only relevant history for Frank concerns the "development of underdevelopment," and this process only begins with the penetration of capitalism. What came before is of little concern to Frank, and he has a good theoretical reason, within his model, for this attitude. Whatever the conditions that characterized various areas, regions, or countries in their original, i.e., pre-capitalist, state, these conditions had little or no impact on subsequent development. Whatever the differences, if any, in their original conditions, all countries that are underdeveloped today are characterized by essentially the same conditions, so that the crucial variables explaining this present condition cannot include the original state.

Frank does discuss conditions in underdeveloped areas before the penetration of capitalism in explaining why some countries became developed and others underdeveloped. The kinds of conditions that enter into the explanation at this point, however, concern natural or physical factors such as natural resources, climate, soil fertility, and the like. They do not include facts about the economic and social structures that predominated in these areas. Thus, if underdevelopment is in the first instance a description of an economic and social condition, then the analogous original conditions, i.e., economic and social, do not enter crucially into the explanation. There is, however, one important historical case where Frank would admit that the original, precapitalist conditions do enter crucially into the explanation. This, of course, is the explanation of the original emergence of capitalism in Europe. But this case is, for the most part, an element of the story of the development of develop-

ment, and not that of underdevelopment. It follows from what has been said that the process of development for Frank is the process of capitalist development, and that the history of development is the history of capitalism.¹¹

Underdevelopment is a condition that characterizes the entire economy of a country, regardless of the different levels of sectoral development. It is a condition, moreover, that characterizes all the presently developing nations. This suggests (although by no means entails) that underdevelopment cannot be explained simply in terms of factors internal to the social and economic histories of the underdeveloped nations, for it seems highly unlikely that the histories of so many nations in different parts of the world with different initial conditions would have been such as to have led to the same outcome. Rather, what is suggested is that there is some common, external causal factor. The theoretical task that Frank undertakes is to identify this factor and incorporate it into a theory that explains the nature and development of underdevelopment.

To accomplish this task, Frank constructs a theoretical model that claims to show how the present condition of underdeveloped countries came about historically and is maintained today. This model employs certain theoretical concepts and posits the existence of certain entities or processes. The concepts are theoretical in the sense that their full meaning can only be grasped in the context of their role in the theoretical model. The posited entities or processes are theoretical in a somewhat different sense. First, their natures can be explained fully only in relation to the model and the theoretical concepts it uses. Second, they cannot be perceived or picked out independently of the theoretical model. They are observable, that is, only through the "lens" of the model. At the same time, the explanatory acceptability of the theoretical model depends, at least in part, on the acceptability of the theoretical concepts. As we shall see below, much of the critical reaction to Frank and, indeed, much of the debate concerning Dependency Theory revolves around the acceptability of various theoretical concepts and their utilization in explanations of development.

The key concept in this model is dependency, hence Dependency Theory. This concept is used to pick out and characterize the object of study, namely, the present condition of developing nations. That is, an initial distinction is assumed between developed and developing countries. What are initially identified as developing countries are supposedly picked out through a comparison with the developed countries in terms of certain indices, for instance, an index of wealth, both as to its level and distribution.¹² The so-called developing nations, Frank then suggests, are better considered as *underdeveloped* rather than *un* developed in order to distinguish states of development historically produced from those that can be considered in some sense "original" conditions. These underdeveloped nations are then characterized as participating in a relation of dependency. It is because of their dependency relationship, which is to be elaborated in the model, that these

countries are underdeveloped. That is, dependency causes underdevelopment.

Dependency relations, in Frank's view, require two parties, one dominant and the other dependent. For Frank, the central dependency relationship exists between the various countries of the developed world and those that are underdeveloped. Historically, the relationship was between a colony and the imperial power that conquered it. Today, it is more a matter of an underdeveloped country and those developed countries with which it has primary economic relations. Various names have been given to the parties to these relationships: metropolis/satellite, core/periphery, or center/periphery.

The metropolis-satellite relationship, to use the terms preferred by Frank, is one of dependency because of two features. First, the development of the satellite is dependent on the development of the metropolis, that is, on forces external to the satellite's economy and society. The suggestion in the model is that it is an asymmetrical relationship, with the development of the metropolis being for the most part independent, that is, determined by factors largely internal to the metropolitan economy and society. Thus, dependency in the first instance is a relation of unequal power. The metropolis has power over the course of development in the satellite, but not vice versa. It should be noted that this power need not be consciously realized or exercised, but might be (and generally is) the unintended result of structural relations and operations.

Frank sees the determining relationship as one-sided. Especially in his early work, he does not pay much attention to the reciprocal influence of the satellite on the metropolis. He has, that is to say, an insufficiently dialectical understanding of the dependency relation. To say that the metropolis exercises greater power in the sense that Frank stipulates need not commit one to the denial that there is a sense in which the metropolis is also dependent on the satellite. The key to the relationship is control. The metropolis exercises greater power in that it has greater control within the relationship, in the way that a slavemaster who has control of slaves exercises greater power over those slaves, even while he or she may be very dependent on the slaves and, in general, on the master-slave relationship to reproduce him or herself as slavemaster.

The dependent development of the satellite is such as to disadvantage it further and exacerbate certain problems it experiences such as poverty and distorted development. The loss for the underdeveloped nation is twofold. Not only is it not in control of its own development, but it does not materially benefit from the relation of dependency. It is worth making this second point because a more sophisticated version of neoclassical theory might argue that developing countries do at times enter into dependency relations with developed nations due to certain types of market asymmetries, but that this dependency (here seen as just loss of control in some respects or to some degree) benefits the developing countries because it fosters development per se. It is

this latter point that Frank denies. Dependency, for Frank, is a relation of exploitation, and, like "exploitation," "dependency" has a definite negative normative force as well as a descriptive role in Frank's theory.¹³ It is also worth pointing out that the object of benefit or harm for Frank is the nation-state as such, rather than, for instance, classes. Frank does discuss the fact that certain classes, local ruling classes, can and do benefit, in the short term at least, from underdevelopment, but this benefit is understood against the backdrop of the harm done to the nation as a whole.

While the locus of dependency relationships in Frank's model is the nation-state and relations between nations, the scope of the theory is properly the world capitalist system. Nations are taken to be component parts of this system. To understand the development of underdevelopment in a particular country, it is necessary to place that country's history in the context of this larger system. It is important, according to Frank, to see capitalism as a world system and to understand its central structures. To fail to do so might well lead one to misidentify both the important structures within the underdeveloped countries and to misunderstand the nature of the dependency relation. Dependency, as we shall see, is explained in terms of its function within the larger system, and the theoretical model used in the explanation must, obviously, correctly characterize the system if the explanation is to be successful. A complete explanation of underdevelopment, then, would require nothing less than a full account of the origin, nature, and development of capitalism, for, as Frank writes, "one and the same historical process of the expansion and development of capitalism throughout the world has simultaneously generated—and continues to generate—both economic development and structural underdevelopment."¹⁴

By specifying that the scope of his theory is the world *capitalist* system, Frank has in effect raised the issue of the definition of "capitalism" that he is using. As various commentators have noted, Frank does not explicitly define "capitalism."¹⁵ Nevertheless, given any number of remarks that he makes, it is a fairly straightforward task to discern how he uses the term. As we have said, Frank takes capitalism to be a world system, one that has existed since at least the sixteenth century. It has gone through three stages: mercantilist, industrial, and financial capitalism. What has remained constant through all the stages is a certain kind of exchange relationship characteristic of metropolis-satellite relations: "Whatever we may wish to say about its mercantilist, then industrial, then financial capitalist metropolis, in the peripheries of the world capitalist system the essential nature of the metropolis-satellite relations remains commercial, however 'feudal' or personal seeming these relations may appear."¹⁶ If the periphery has been capitalist since the first European incursions, and if what has remained constant across the various stages is the nature of the exchange relations, then capitalism must be defined in terms of this relation.¹⁷ Laclau fills out this definition attributed to Frank in the following way: Frank understands by capitalism "a) a system

of production for the market, in which b) profit constitutes the motive of production, and c) this profit is realized for the benefit of someone other than the direct producer, who is thereby dispossessed of it."¹⁸

If capitalism is defined in terms of market exchange relations of a certain kind, we should specify more exactly what kind they are. As we have seen, according to Laclau's interpretation of Frank, the essential capitalist relation is a market exchange whereby profit is realized for the benefit of someone other than the direct producer. We have also seen that dependency relations in general for Frank involve power relations where one party is disadvantaged to the gain of the other. Third, we have noted that for Frank, the dependency relations that generate underdevelopment must be understood in terms of the capitalist world system. Putting these points together, we can conclude that, for Frank, the essential capitalist relation is a dependency relation and thus a relation of power. In other words, capitalism in the first instance is to be regarded as a system of power, power exercised through a particular form of relation, namely, a market exchange relation.

(In what sense are capitalist market exchange relations relations of power? According to Frank, dependency relations in general and metropolis-satellite relations within capitalism in particular are best characterized as monopolistic and extractive. The metropolis exerts monopolistic control over economic and trade relations in the periphery. Monopoly domination within a market is, of course, a position of power. This position of power allows the metropolis to extract an economic surplus from the satellite. The appropriation of this surplus and its accumulation in and under the control of the metropolis is the central factor that deprives the underdeveloped nation of the ability to control its own growth and that thus leaves it dependent. The monopolistic, extractive relation was initially established by force of arms, but once it is in place, subsequent development perpetuates it through the structures of dependency and underdevelopment.

Two points should be noted about the monopolistic-extractive nature of the metropolis-satellite relation. The first is that any theory that attempts to conceptualize economic exchanges in what Frank considers the underdeveloped nations in terms of equivalent market exchanges necessarily, from his point of view, distorts the nature of what transpires. The outstanding theoretical issue is, of course, how to verify the existence of monopolistic market distortions and the "exploitative" transfer of surplus. This is a fundamental point of contention between neoclassical theories and Dependency Theory. In general, where a neoclassical theorist would see a free market and mutual advantage, Frank sees a structure of monopolistic relations and surplus transfer.

The second point to note is that Frank's concept of economic surplus is taken more or less directly from the work of Paul Baran. Frank appears to believe that Baran's concept is the same as that used by Marx in his analysis of "the surplus value created by producers and its appropriation by capital-

ists."¹⁹ Many commentators have pointed out, however, that according to Marx's theory, the extraction of surplus takes place within the capital-wage labor relation within production, while for Frank, the extraction is a function of exchange relations in the market. The two concepts are, therefore, not the same. One difference to be noted in this context is that Marx emphasizes that for the purposes of his model he is assuming that market relations are exchanges of equivalents, while, as we have seen, Frank takes them to be monopolistic power relations involving the exchange of non-equivalents.

If Frank does conceive of capitalism in terms of a certain kind of market exchange relation, with production oriented towards the market, then three points should be noted that will be relevant to later criticisms of Frank. First, if the nature of the metropolis-satellite relationship remains a constant, then the analysis of the "development of underdevelopment" is, in a certain sense, ahistorical.²⁰ The central dynamic and structures are the same at all points in the history of the phenomenon. For Frank, the focus of his theory, therefore, is "the continuity and ubiquity of the structural essentials of economic development and underdevelopment throughout the expansion and development of the capitalist system at all times and places."²¹ What is to be emphasized is continuity, not change.

Second, what defines the essential nature of an economic relation is its relationship to the larger system, and in particular, whether it is caught up in a commercial market exchange network that is connected to metropolitan development. Thus Frank can say, in the quotation given above, that however "feudal seeming" a relation may be, if it is part of such a market network, then the relation is capitalist. Among the things to be noted here is the implication for the theory-ladenness of the possible observations involved. Merely observing a relation in a supposedly theory-neutral way would not allow the correct characterization of the relation. A relation that might at first observation be "seen" as feudal is really not feudal. Only by viewing it in terms of the theory can the relation be "seen" correctly.

The third point to be noted in light of Frank's definition of capitalism is that he focuses on exchange relations and pays relatively little attention to the so-called relations of production. This emphasis is especially obvious in his early work. The concept of the relations of production is one that is traditionally prominent in many Marxist analyses. Therefore, some Marxist critics in particular take exception to Frank on this point. And as we shall see, the dispute over where the theoretical emphasis should be placed, on exchange or on production relations, is one of the key points in the Dependency Theory debates. In part the dispute is over what is to function as the key explanatory variable or, in terms of the theoretical model, over what is to be taken as an independent and what as a dependent variable.

In our discussion of dependency relations thus far we have focused on the form of the relation of metropolis to satellite at the level of nation-states. This relation is the primary one within Frank's model. However, the nation-

nation relation is not the only form of a metropolis-satellite relation for Frank. Rather, there is a chain of such relationships, all of which manifest the same form or structure. At the pinnacle of this chain is the nation-nation relationship of metropolis-satellite. But within the satellite itself, the structurally identical relationship is repeated on lower and increasingly local levels of the economy. The theoretical model, then, can be seen as a series of steps, each connection from step to lower step reiterating the same structural relations. As Frank puts it:

It is a major thesis of this essay that this same structure extends from the macrometropolitan center of the world capitalist system "down" to the most supposedly isolated agricultural workers, who, through this chain of interlinked metropolitan-satellite relationships, are tied to the central world metropolis and thereby incorporated into the world capitalist system as a whole.²²

There may seem at first to be real differences among the variety of metropolis-satellite dependency relationships; for instance, a nation-nation relationship seems very unlike that between an owner of a latifundium and a dependent sharecropper. Nevertheless, Frank maintains, they are essentially the same in structure, and it is their structure that determines their nature, despite the ready and apparent surface differences. This point, of course, can only be appreciated by "seeing" the relationships through the lens of the appropriate theory.

One last feature of Frank's theoretical model needs to be mentioned. The model has definite implications for the type of political developments and, in particular, for the nature of the class structure that one can expect to accompany the development of economic underdevelopment. It is necessary for Frank to speak to the issue of political development in order to provide some mechanism to account for how the policy of underdevelopment, as he calls it, is put into effect and maintained, especially after an underdeveloped colony achieves de jure independence, thus making the option to use the open coercion of an imperial power less available.²³

Within the model, classes are understood in the first instance in terms of structural positions within a system of power relations. At each point in the metropolis-satellite chain, the structure of the chain creates certain objective interests, most important, the interest in controlling the monopoly relationship at that point in the chain so as to be able to benefit from the extractive power available at that position. The group that coheres around that interest is in effect the ruling class of that area, region, or nation. Since the ruling class at each point in the structure is dependent on the entire structure remaining more or less the same, so that the monopoly relationships can be maintained, each ruling class in effect bolsters every other ruling class. All ruling classes thus have an interest in perpetuating the development of

underdevelopment, for that is precisely the structure that allows them to satisfy their interests as they find them. As Frank puts it:

My thesis holds that the group interests which led to the continued underdevelopment of Chile [as a case in point] and the economic development of some other countries were themselves created by the same economic structure which encompassed all these groups: the world capitalist system. . . . It was in the nature of the structure of this system to produce interests leading to underdevelopment in the countries of the periphery, such as Chile, once they had already been effectively incorporated into the system as satellites.²⁴

Frank does not explicitly address the question of why the same groups that were economically powerful were also politically dominant, so that they could implement politically the policies that would benefit them economically. Any attempt on the part of Frank to fill in this gap, either in terms of an instrumental version of the Marxist theory of the state, or in terms of a general theory of the convergence of economic and political elites, would only push the problem back one level.

The theoretical model sketched above is to be found in Frank's early work. His later work carries the model forward in most of its essentials, but there are a few points of theoretical development, especially in *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*, that deserve a brief mention.²⁵ In this book, Frank announces that he is responding to three criticisms of his earlier work. The three criticisms amount in effect to the charges that Frank did not pay sufficient attention to relations of production and thus overemphasized external as opposed to internal variables in his explanation of underdevelopment; that he was insufficiently historical and thus failed to appreciate and account for important differences across stages of the development of underdevelopment; and that he did not succeed in demonstrating the interconnections between metropolitan development and the dependent underdevelopment.²⁶ In response, Frank admits that a complete theoretical model of underdevelopment would have to pay more attention to the mode of production within the underdeveloped nation and to how it changes or does not change through the different stages of capitalist development. Furthermore, it would have to be more sensitive to the ways in which the dynamic of the development of underdevelopment can help to determine the nature of metropolitan development, which, of course, in turn helps determine the further course of the development of underdevelopment; or in a word, Frank admits that his model should be more dialectical. He thinks that these changes can be incorporated by refocusing the model more on the accumulation process seen from the point of view of the world system.

We cannot go into a thorough analysis of how Frank amends his theoretical model to account for these criticisms. It will have to suffice to say that

while his focus in *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment* is somewhat different from that of his earlier work in that more attention is paid to accumulation on the world scale, the essentials of his model still remain more or less as they were and as we outlined them above. Despite discussions of the accumulation process, his work still seems to focus on capitalism as, in the first instance, a process of exchange and not of a certain form of relations of production. Frank does in this later work use the concept of mode of production, but he offers no real analysis of the concept, and it seems to function less as an explanatory concept and more as a way of indicating awareness of historical difference. "Mode of production" as used by Frank allows him to mark off different ways in which dependent economies have been organized. But to the degree that the concept is focused on the organization of production, it remains subordinated to the notion of exchange relations. Whatever the mode of production within the dependent country, the satellite is still considered to exist within the world capitalist system and thus in the last analysis to be capitalist. In the end, we believe that Frank's theoretical model and its explanatory force remains basically the same in his later work.

Before going on to discuss other positions in the Dependency Theory debates that developed out of or in opposition to Frank, it is worth examining some of the criticisms of Frank. In particular, we will look in detail at the arguments of two critics, Lall and Brenner. They can be seen as two representative positions critical of the original formulation of Dependency Theory by Frank. Lall concentrates on the adequacy of the concept of dependence. Brenner casts a wider net, questioning Frank's use of concepts such as capitalism and class, and arguing that Frank has the order of explanation wrong. The arguments of a third critic, Laclau, will then figure in our discussion of the Modes of Production approach. While those are only three among the many critics of Frank, they raise interesting and important theoretical issues that help illuminate Frank's approach to development.

III. TWO METHODOLOGICAL CRITICS OF FRANK

Lall

Sanjaya Lall provides a somewhat limited but methodologically interesting criticism of Frank.²⁷ Lall's focus is the use of the concept of dependence. His concern, as a sympathetic critic of dependency theory, is that the central concept of the theory, that of a dependency relation, or as he puts it, dependence, has not been adequately formulated. In particular, Lall thinks that the concept sometimes seems to be defined in a circular or question-begging manner.

Less developed countries (LDCs) are poor because they are dependent, and any characteristics that they display signify dependence. In such

tautologous definitions, "dependence" tends to be identified with features of LDCs which the economist in question happens to dislike, and ceases to offer an independent and verifiable explanation of the processes at work in the less developed world.²⁸

Lall suggests two criteria that should be used to construct an adequate concept of dependence. The first criterion stipulates that the concept "lay down certain characteristics of dependent economies which are not found in non-dependent ones." The second criterion stipulates further that the characteristics so designated "must be shown to affect adversely the course and pattern of development of the dependent countries."²⁹

To understand what Lall's point is in suggesting these criteria, it is important to keep in mind a central thesis of dependency theory, namely, that dependence causes underdevelopment. If this thesis is interpreted as an ordinary causal claim, then its claim is that there is a correlation that supports a causal relation between two variables, the condition of being dependent and the condition of being underdeveloped. Now, if we are to verify this thesis, it must be possible to identify these two conditions independently of one another. If, as Lall suggests happens, the condition of being dependent is "identified with features of LDCs which the economist in question happens to dislike," then there is a considerable chance that the same characteristics used to identify one condition will be used to pick out the other. This is especially true given that dependency theory conceives of underdevelopment as a condition that is the result of and results in adverse effects. For example, if being poor is taken to be an essential characteristic of economies that are underdeveloped, then if "dependence" is defined in terms of, or picked out by, the state of being poor, it becomes true by definition that dependent economies are underdeveloped. But if this proposition is true by definition, it cannot be taken to be expressing a causal relation.

For the same reasons that it is necessary to identify the condition of being dependent independently of the condition of being underdeveloped, it is necessary to be able to differentiate dependent from nondependent economies. Again, consider the thesis, dependence causes underdevelopment. Assume that all economies in the world can be (roughly) categorized as either dependent or nondependent. Now, if the thesis is to have any explanatory merit, given our assumption, then it must be true that an economy is underdeveloped if and only if it is dependent. This is just to say that the condition of underdevelopment is caused by, and only by, the condition of dependence. What if, however, the characteristics used to pick out the condition of dependence were also true of some or all economies that are taken initially to be nondependent? If this were the case, then obviously the causal thesis could not be coherently applied and tested.

But this is just what Lall thinks is the case. He surveys a variety of attempts to differentiate dependent from nondependent economies, attempts that include the use of economic and noneconomic, static and dynamic char-

acteristics. In all instances, Lall concludes, the attempt fails. Whatever characteristic or set of characteristics is used, either it applies to some nondependent economy as well as to dependent ones, or it fails to apply to all dependent ones. Lall's conclusion is the strong one that

the concept of dependence as applied to less developed countries is impossible to define and cannot be shown to be causally related to a continuance of underdevelopment. It is usually given an *arbitrarily selective definition which picks certain features of a much broader phenomenon of international capitalist development*, and its selectivity only serves to misdirect analysis and research in this area.³⁰

In our opinion, Lall's conclusion is a little strong, or at least a little premature. We do find much of his analysis of the use of the concept of dependence convincing as a criticism internal to Dependency Theory. Dependency theorists do need to pay more attention to the construction of their concepts, especially that of dependence. However, even if all attempts so far to construct an adequate concept have failed, that does not prove that the project as such is wrong-headed and that all future attempts will fail.

An additional point should be made concerning Lall's criticism. Consider again his claim that all attempts to construct a concept of dependence have failed to provide a concept that applies to all, and only to, dependent economies. This claim, however, seems to presuppose that there is a way of initially distinguishing all economies as either dependent or nondependent so as to be able to determine whether a concept does or does not apply to them. In other words, the denial of the adequacy of all concept candidates so far seems itself to presuppose an adequate concept. This may be stating the point too strongly, however. We might interpret Lall's claim in the following way: There are certain economies, let us say those of the very poorest LDCs, that everyone can agree initially are dependent.³¹ Likewise, there are certain economies that everyone can initially agree are nondependent. Let us attempt to construct a concept of dependence by generalizing from what seem to be the salient characteristics of these clear cases. Lall's claim, thus interpreted, is that no concept that will be adequate can be constructed in this way. Again, we feel that this claim has an a priori ring about it that Lall's argument, which is essentially inductive, cannot substantiate.

Further, a determined dependency theorist has available the following reply to Lall: "Even though my concept of dependence seems to you [Lall] to pick out some economies that you consider to be nondependent, I disagree. I have carefully constructed my concept and it is a coherent and convincing one, stipulating conditions that if true, must demonstrate the existence of dependence. Thus, I consider as dependent all economies to which it applies, even those that you, given your initial intuitions, want to claim are nondependent. That is, I use my concept to overrule your (and perhaps my own)

intuitions. That is part of the way science progresses." Lall obviously has a reply to his critic, and the discussion goes on. We cannot follow it any further here. Lall's criticism is a methodologically important one, but not one that leaves the determined dependency theorist bereft of moves.

Brenner

Robert Brenner presents a more wide-ranging and extensive criticism of Frank than that of Lall. Brenner concedes that Frank's descriptions of the mechanisms of surplus transfer from the underdeveloped periphery to the developed core and of the resulting distortion of the economies of the periphery "clearly capture important aspects of the functioning reality of underdevelopment."³² But in Brenner's opinion, while Frank's account may have descriptive adequacy, it fails to explain anything. In particular, it fails to explain the origins of underdevelopment. That is, Brenner rejects Frank's thesis that the development of underdevelopment is part of and necessitated by the development of capitalism in the metropolis.

Most of Brenner's argument is directed against the work of Sweezy and Wallerstein rather than Frank.³³ Since, however, Brenner sees Wallerstein's project of discovering the roots of development in the core as a continuation of and complement to Frank's work, the criticisms can be taken to apply to both theorists. The major problem Brenner has with the Frank-Wallerstein position has to do with the definition of capitalism it assumes. As we saw above, Frank (and Wallerstein) conceptualizes capitalism in terms of a system of power exercised through exchange relations and involving production oriented toward profit in the market. The essential relation marking an economy as capitalist, the point at which power is in the first instance exercised, is a certain type of market exchange within a world system of metropolis-satellite dependency relations.

According to Brenner, it follows from this conception of capitalism that the accumulation process is centrally concerned with the generation of absolute surplus value, value that is extracted by casting a wider and more intensive net over labor. It also follows from this starting point that the issue of the origins and development of capitalism primarily concerns the rise of a world commercial network and an expanding world market. In addition, Brenner argues that Frank and Wallerstein's model of capitalism leads them to understand class structure as determined in a rather mechanistic fashion by market relations. Market opportunities determine the nature of economic development in a given area, and in particular, the nature of production. The resulting requirements on production, in turn, determine the nature of the class structure. The classes that arise are structured by the dominant production process, and the production process that arises is the one best suited in a given area at a given time to allow the maximum extraction of absolute surplus value by the ruling class. This model and the explanation of both

development and underdevelopment that it supports is, according to Brenner, theoretically inadequate and leads to empirically false explanations.

To appreciate why Brenner takes the Frank-Wallerstein position to be theoretically and explanatorily inadequate, it is necessary to contrast it with Brenner's understanding of capitalism. For Brenner, the defining and unique characteristic of capitalism is its tendency, not simply to develop, but to do so by way of expanding the productive forces. In other words, capitalism is a system of production involving, in particular, the extraction of *relative surplus value*.

For capitalism differs from all pre-capitalist modes of production in its *systematic* tendency to unprecedented, though neither continuous nor unlimited, economic development—in particular through the expansion of what might be called (after Marx's terminology) *relative* as opposed to *absolute surplus value*.³⁴

Expansion of productivity through technical innovation, Marx's revolutionary expansion of the forces of production, can occur only where it is possible to move labor in and out of the production process as best suits the available technology. Otherwise, the incentive for innovation would be lacking. But this form of labor mobility, according to Brenner, can only occur within a certain class structure, namely, one where labor is free wage labor that is at the mercy of market forces, in other words, where labor-power is a commodity. Thus, in Brenner's view, capitalism as a system of production oriented toward a specific form of accumulation (based on the extraction of relative surplus value) necessitates a specific class structure. But in contrast to the Frank-Wallerstein view, Brenner's position is that capitalism does not create the class structure it requires. Rather, capitalism can only exist within the confines of this class structure. The initial emergence of this class structure is thus a necessary condition for the emergence of capitalism, and the reproduction of this class structure is a necessary condition for the continued reproduction of capitalism. The problem of the origins of capitalism for Brenner, then, is not the development of a world market system as it is for the Frank-Wallerstein position. Rather, the problem for Brenner is the emergence of the necessary class structure, or in other words, the genesis of labor-power as a commodity.

Brenner's model of capitalism, then, leads to the result that the crucial explanatory variable in his account of underdevelopment is the class structure. Capitalism can exist only where the class structure accommodates it. And what ultimately determines the class structure are the outcomes of class struggles. The outcomes of class struggles, however, according to Brenner, cannot be determined in advance; it is not a matter of a mechanistic, deterministic process. Rather, in each instance under study, the particular condi-

tions of class conflict, especially the opportunities available to the "ruling class" to exploit labor through extraction of either absolute or relative surplus value, must be analyzed in order to understand the possibilities inherent in the situation that could, but did not have to be, realized. Market opportunities do not determine class, as in the Frank-Wallerstein view. Rather, the outcomes of class struggle condition what kind of market relations are to be engaged in, for example, whether profit maximization is to be pursued. On Brenner's view, and contrary to Frank and Wallerstein, "neither economic development nor underdevelopment are *directly* dependent upon, caused by, one another. Each is the product of a specific evolution of class relations, *in part* determined historically 'outside' capitalism, in relationship with non-capitalist modes."³⁵

Development and underdevelopment, thus, are explained by Brenner in terms of the particular opportunities for surplus extraction made possible by the different class configurations, free wage labor, in the case of development, and forced feudal or slave labor, at least initially, in the case of underdevelopment. In particular,

the onset of a capitalist dynamic of development was thus, in the first appearance, made possible as an unintended consequence of class conflicts—conflicts in which the peasantry freed themselves from the extra-economic controls of the ruling class, while the latter secured ownership of the land. The resulting overall class structure of production and reproduction made possible an unprecedented degree of correspondence between the needs of surplus extraction and the *continuing development* of the productive forces through accumulation and innovation.³⁶

Similarly,

the development of underdevelopment was rooted in the class structure of production based on the extension of absolute surplus labour, which determined a sharp *disjunction* between the requirements for the development of the productive forces (productivity of labour) and the structure of profitability of the economy as a whole.³⁷

Brenner, then, presents a model of capitalism that contrasts with that of Frank, not so much in terms of the description of underdevelopment, as in the account of the origins of the structures that produce the conditions of underdevelopment. The two positions start off with different conceptions of capitalism. This initial difference leads to differences concerning the central dynamic of capitalism, in particular, the nature of the characteristic accumulation process. Given these differences, Brenner and Frank arrive at different conclusions about the importance of class structure as an explanatory varia-

ble. For Brenner it is central; for Frank it plays at best a minor explanatory role. It is important to reiterate that for Brenner, class structure is the outcome of class struggles, and the outcome of class struggles cannot be determined in advance; or at least, the outcome is a variable the determination of which falls outside the theoretical model in question.

We have, then, two contrasting models and an important difference in the form of explanation involved in each. How might we decide between them? We cannot give a complete answer to this question here. But it is instructive to summarize the nature of the criticisms that Brenner makes of the Frank-Wallerstein position. First, as we have seen, Brenner contends that the Frank-Wallerstein view is empirically inadequate. Brenner presents case studies of development in Poland, France, England, the Caribbean, and Virginia. In each case, Brenner argues, what happened historically can better be accounted for by his model of capitalism than by the Frank-Wallerstein model. On this level, joining the argument would require that both parties agree on some initial description of what actually occurred in each case history. Each side would then have to attempt to demonstrate in detail why its theoretical redescription and explanation of the history was superior to its rival. This process obviously does not admit of a clear way to establish the superior position, and it has the possible immediate problem of the two sides not agreeing even as to a common initial description of the subject matter.

The second form of criticism is based on conceptual analysis. Here the important claim made by Brenner is that the definition of capitalism used by Frank and Wallerstein is inadequate. The argument is that their definition gives a necessary but not sufficient condition for the existence of capitalism. Brenner admits that "there is no doubt that capitalism is a system in which production for a profit via exchange predominates." However, "production for exchange is perfectly compatible with a system in which it is either unnecessary or impossible, or both, to reinvest in expanded, improved production in order to 'profit.'"³⁸ The claim is that production for exchange for profit is compatible with, and indeed takes place in, systems that even Frank and Wallerstein would have to admit were not capitalist. They could reply, of course, by denying that such systems were capitalist or by claiming that it is a matter of degree, and therefore that once production for exchange for profit becomes the dominant relation, the claimed compatibility is no longer possible. A second criticism follows from Brenner's claim that there are problems with how Frank and Wallerstein understand some of their basic concepts. This charge is that the difficulties in correctly conceptualizing the object of study prevent Frank and Wallerstein from being able to raise certain questions that Brenner finds important. And in turn, not being able to raise certain questions further prevents Frank and Wallerstein from being able to confront and explain certain facts that Brenner holds as central to his account.³⁹ This charge, of course, could be parried by denying the importance of the questions and facts under contention.

The third form of criticism has to do with explanatory adequacy. Brenner makes a number of points in this regard. For example, the Frank-Wallerstein model, Brenner contends, assumes that the individuals who control the means of production have the motivation, the rationality, and the freedom to pursue profit maximization. That is, as Brenner interprets it, the model assumes "the extra-historical universe of *homo oeconomicus*, of individual profit maximizers competing on the market, outside of any system of social relations of exploitation."⁴⁰ But there are at least two related problems with this assumption. In the first place, this assumed universe is not some abstract, extra-historical realm; rather, it is the world of capitalism. The conditions specified by this model exist in, and only in, the capitalist market. Insofar as this model is used to explain the initial emergence of capitalism, and insofar as it assumes in its explanatory framework conditions that only exist within capitalism, it obviously begs the question.⁴¹

This is a familiar criticism, made first by Marx of Adam Smith. It is because Brenner finds Sweezy, Frank, and Wallerstein all guilty of this same fundamental mistake, as well as guilty of sharing "individualistic-mechanist presuppositions" with Smith, that he labels them "neo-Smithians." They are, however, neo-Smithians with a twist, or rather, an inversion, for "it has been their [Sweezy, Frank, Wallerstein] intention to negate the optimistic model of economic advance derived from Adam Smith."⁴² Smith's model of economic development is inverted to become Frank's model of the development of underdevelopment. The result of this inversion, according to Brenner, is "an alternative theory of capitalist development which is, in its central aspects, the mirror image of the 'progressist' thesis they wish to surpass."⁴³

The second problem with the assumption of rational profit-maximization is that it reflects the failure on the part of both Frank and Wallerstein to understand adequately the relations between individuals and social structures, in particular, class structures. In Brenner's view, the individual is much more produced by and constrained by class structures than Frank or Wallerstein seem to allow. This criticism is of a piece with Brenner's contention that Frank and Wallerstein do not accord class structure its proper explanatory role as a variable. As Brenner reads them, Frank and Wallerstein make class structure (reflected first of all in the relations of production) a consequence of the behavior of rational individuals in the market. For Brenner, this view has the relationship completely backwards. Individual rationality and behavior must be understood as conditioned and constrained by the existing class structure. Not to see the relation in this way, Brenner implies, is to have a fundamental mistake at the very basis of one's social theory.⁴⁴

This discussion does not exhaust the criticisms Brenner makes of the Frank-Wallerstein model, to say nothing of criticisms made by other commentators in the debates over Dependency Theory.⁴⁵ The criticisms we have mentioned do reflect, however, some of the levels on which the issues are joined and some of the more methodological considerations that enter into

the debates. We now proceed to examine some of the positions that have emerged out of these debates with Frank.

IV. THE MODES OF PRODUCTION SCHOOL

The debate concerning Dependency Theory entered a new stage with the emergence of the Modes of Production (MOP) school. The various approaches encompassed by this rubric represent both a criticism of the early forms of Dependency Theory, chiefly as represented by the writings of Frank (and, later, Wallerstein), and an extension of the basic problematic of Dependency Theory. The focus of the explanation of the persistence of underdevelopment is shifted by the MOP theorists away from what they understand to be the excessive emphasis in traditional Dependency Theory on a global scheme that exaggerates the role of external relations and markets. Instead, while not denying the importance of macro phenomena, relations between nations, and flows of commodities, they have focused on developing the concept of mode of production in an attempt to construct an alternative understanding of the phenomenon of underdevelopment. Despite the shift of focus, the object of investigation remains the specific forms of development of what is taken to be the periphery of the world economy. Moreover, the concepts of dependency and underdevelopment, although defined differently, are not themselves challenged. In this sense, the MOP school represents not a break from but, rather, an alternative formulation and extension of Dependency Theory itself.

Within the MOP school, three basic approaches can be distinguished. The "articulation of MOP" approach, as it has been termed, tends to explain the phenomenon of underdevelopment in terms of the relationships among and between the capitalist and other, noncapitalist modes of production existing within underdeveloped economies.⁴⁶ A second related approach, that of the "colonial or peripheral MOP," has sought to develop a set of concepts of modes of production that are specific to the colonial experiences and peripheral status of the developing countries.⁴⁷ According to this group of theorists, the concepts of modes of production that should be used to analyze the societies of the periphery are fundamentally different from those that have been used to investigate the countries of the center. Finally, there are MOP theorists who focus on what they call the "internationalization of capital" or the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production.⁴⁸ In this view, international development (including development within specific nations) is analyzed in terms of the presumed dominance of the capitalist mode of production in the world economy. Each one of these approaches has staked out a different position in the dependency theory debate. The starting point in all cases is a concept of mode of production; however, they represent three alternative ways of constructing a theoretical model in terms of which an explanation of the past and present economic and social structures of developing countries can be generated.

Background

Although the work of many of the MOP theorists has been relatively well documented,⁴⁹ the theoretical sources of this attempt to analyze development by using concepts of modes of production are less well known. There are five major points that should be briefly elaborated. First, the various efforts to construct a theory centered on concepts of modes of production grew out of attempts to provide a link between Frank's relatively global model of metropolis-satellite relations and the ethnographic detail that emerged from detailed, especially anthropological, studies of developing countries. Many researchers found it difficult to relate the wealth of empirical detail generated in the course of field work to the overarching logic of patterns of surplus transfer between the core and periphery of the world economy that form the focus of Frank's model.⁵⁰ The concepts and conceptual strategies of a group of French anthropologists who analyzed African underdevelopment in terms of modes of production represented one attempt to bridge this gap between existing theory and empirical research.⁵¹

A second factor that gave rise to the proliferation of MOP approaches to development was the reaction against Frank's seeing "capitalism everywhere," that is, that commodity flows or markets were present and such markets were sufficient to characterize the society in question as capitalist. Laclau's *New Left Review* article is the *locus classicus* of this criticism of Frank's work.⁵² Frank was accused of making all of the underdeveloped countries' social structures capitalist, from the sixteenth century onward, because he mistakenly identified markets or trade relations with capitalism. Laclau's alternative was to emphasize the primacy of the conditions of production over those of exchange.

To this end, Laclau proceeded to define a concept of mode of production as a combination of four factors: the pattern of ownership of the means of production, the form of appropriation of what he called an economic surplus, the degree of the division of labor, and the level of development of the forces of production.⁵³ In addition, Laclau distinguishes between a "mode of production" and an "economic system" to take account of the participation of *precapitalist modes of production* in a world capitalist economic system. An economic system is generally defined by Laclau as an articulated (or combined) set of different modes of production. In particular, the world capitalist system is not conceived to be a uniform production system, that is, a system with one exclusive mode of production. Rather, it is conceived to be an economic system in which both capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production coexist and which is characterized by the predominance of the capitalist mode of production. According to Laclau, Marxist theorists should attempt to understand underdeveloped countries in terms of the system of relations—the articulation—between the capitalist and other, noncapitalist modes of production, rather than in terms of Frank's homogeneous capitalist relations.

Third, the use of the concept of mode of production in Laclau's critique

of Frank and as the basis of an alternative framework of analysis that displaces Frank's focus on commodity flows was itself predicated on a return to the work of Marx through the writings of Althusser and Balibar.⁵⁴ These two French theorists had taken up the project of reformulating the basic concepts of historical materialism. Among their primary concerns was to combat what they considered to be various non-Marxist forms of "essentialism" within the Marxist theoretical tradition.⁵⁵ In particular, the explanation of social phenomena in terms of an essential human nature or an economic determinism was criticized. Their effort to formulate a concept of mode of production, along with the concept of overdetermination, and to produce a nonessentialist Marxist social theory was central to the emergence of the concept of mode of production as an object of theoretical attention.

A fourth source of the MOP school was the reexamination of Marx's own analysis of the so-called original accumulation of capital and the transition from feudalism to capitalism. Marx's account of the emergence and development of some of the economic, political, and cultural conditions of capitalism in a noncapitalist, feudal setting is filtered through the Dobb-Sweezy "transition debate" to become an additional component of the MOP analysis of the transition to capitalism in developing countries.⁵⁶ The relevance of the transition debate is twofold. First, the MOP analysis of underdevelopment is concerned with the emergence, or lack thereof, of the capitalist mode of production in the developing countries and hence, implicitly or explicitly, with a comparison with the European experience. Second, once the idea of transition (e.g., to the capitalist mode of production) is analyzed, the combined existence of different, capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production during the period of transition becomes an object of theoretical attention.

Finally, the work of Hindess and Hirst deserves brief mention.⁵⁷ Although not explicitly addressed to the question of developing countries, theirs is arguably the most sophisticated attempt to construct a set of concepts of noncapitalist modes of production. Their analyses of primitive communal, ancient, slave, and feudal modes of production were particularly instructive. However, their subsequent rejection, based on both methodological and epistemological considerations, of the concept of mode of production has received much less attention in the MOP literature.⁵⁸

These are some of the historical and theoretical conditions, among others, out of which the MOP school emerged and to which it has responded over time. We turn now to a brief summary of the three approaches that have used the concept MOP as their entry-point into the analysis of dependency and underdevelopment.

Articulation of Modes of Production

Laclau's critique of Frank announced the beginning of a Marxian reconceptualization of dependency theory based on the articulation of modes of produc-

tion. Taking the concept of modes of production as their starting point, articulation of MOP theorists have sought to analyze the relations among and between the various possible capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production. The overriding objective has been, following Laclau, to produce a general theory of the articulation of modes of production within a capitalist economic system. The central focus of the articulation of MOP theorists is, in particular, the system of relations between the capitalist mode of production and the set of preexisting noncapitalist modes of production in the developing countries. A principal methodological concern in understanding this approach, then, is the constitution and use of the central concepts of mode of production and articulation within their theoretical model.

How can different capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production be combined or articulated in a single social formation within the context of ultimate capitalist development? In general, three alternative forms or models might be used to answer this question. The two salient variables of these models are the form of interaction and the degree of dominance by one mode of production over the others. One possibility is that the various modes of production are seen to exist alongside but essentially independent of one another. This position has traditionally been called "dualism" and Frank's original rejection of it is shared by the articulation of MOP theorists. A second answer is that the various modes of production in any particular society are interrelated under the dominance of one of these modes of production. One mode of production, for example, capitalism, would be understood to dominate the others in the sense of determining the nature of their existence—their reproduction over time, any changes they may undergo, and their eventual demise. A third possible model holds that the modes of production are combined in such a way that there is, in general, no dominant mode of production. Thus, there would be no general outcome of the articulation of modes of production in the sense of one mode necessarily "winning out" over all others. The only way to understand the particular outcome of articulation, for instance, capitalist development, would be in terms of the analysis of the specific factors involved in the concrete combination of modes of production in any particular society.

The second alternative (that of capitalist dominance) still admits of two possibilities that should be noted. On the one hand, the articulation of modes of production may be such that capitalism clearly and quickly overwhelms and determines the outcome of other modes of production. The result is that the transition to the exclusive existence of capitalism would be of relatively short duration. On the other hand, the transition to capitalism may be understood as a long and complex process, such that any society in transition can only be understood in terms of different stages of articulation between the capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production.

The first variation of this position of the general dominance of the capitalist mode of production is usually attributed to the early theorists of

imperialism, writers such as Lenin and Luxemburg.⁵⁹ The articulation of MOP theorists, in contrast, adopt the second variation of the second alternative. Central to this latter view is an understanding of the transition to capitalism as long and problematic, and thus in need of detailed analysis in each case.

It is necessary, then, to understand the notion of articulation in this light. "Articulation," as it is used to analyze the combined presence of different capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production during the course of transition to capitalism, takes on the dual meaning of "joining together" and "giving expression to."⁶⁰ Modes of production are conceived to be articulated in a social formation such that (a) the development of each mode of production is closely connected with, in the sense of being both dependent on and/or determined by, the other modes of production; and (b) the way that one mode of production is manifested or expressed cannot be analyzed independently of how others are manifested.

Rey is one theorist who has attempted to produce a general theory of the relations among modes of production within a peripheral capitalist economic system using the concept of articulation.⁶¹ His theory specifies three distinct and successive stages of articulation. In the first stage, the capitalist mode of production is "imported" into the noncapitalist peripheral society and proceeds to reinforce and, in some instances, to create noncapitalist modes of production. Second, capitalism "takes root" and uses, from its dominant position, the noncapitalist modes of production. Finally, at some point not yet reached by most developing countries, the capitalist mode of production supplants all noncapitalist modes of production: noncapitalism disappears. The often violent and prolonged nature of these stages of articulation in peripheral societies serves, in Rey's framework of analysis, to distinguish the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production in the periphery from the articulation between capitalism and feudalism in Western Europe. Rey's unidirectional sequence of stages is more or less shared by all members of the articulation of MOP approach.

A more concrete, albeit schematic, example will serve to illustrate some of the salient features of this articulation of MOP approach and to compare it to the other two approaches discussed below. Postcolonial nineteenth-century Peru can be analyzed in terms of the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production. In particular, Peruvian society during that period of time can be understood as comprising at least the primitive communal, feudal, and capitalist modes of production. The primitive communal mode of production was a more or less direct descendant of the precolonial Incan *ayllu* or clan-based community. The Peruvian hacienda can be conceptualized in terms of the lord-serf relations of the feudal mode of production. Finally, the incipient development of the capitalist mode of production within Peru could be found in the organization of the recovery of guano (bird droppings used as fertilizer) for eventual export to England.

Two aspects of the articulation between these capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production, while not exhaustive, illustrate the approach. First, the initial instance of capitalist development was a product of capitalist development in England; the capitalist mode of production did not emerge within any of the Peruvian noncapitalist modes of production. Guano was commercialized by British capital exports and served as a cheap raw material for further capitalist development in England. This form of capitalist export production led neither to the development of a domestic capitalist class nor to the expansion of the internal market for further capitalist development. Second, this form of dependent capitalist development served to reinforce the predominance of the feudal mode of production in the rural areas. For example, a combined strategy of debt, purchase, and forcible expropriation led to the destruction of the communal *comunidades indigenas* and allowed the increased concentration of land in feudal latifundia. Neither capitalist agriculture nor capitalist industry developed to any significant degree at this time. The (noncapitalist) feudal mode of production was first created (in the colonial period), then reinforced (in the nineteenth century), and only gradually supplanted (well into the 1960s) by the development of the capitalist mode of production. The result of this articulation of modes of production was continued dependency and underdevelopment at the periphery of the world economy.

The articulation of MOP approach, then, is meant to provide a conceptual framework to analyze the interrelations between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production as they manifest themselves in peripheral societies. The particular concern is to map out the development of capitalism from entry to hegemony where it was imposed initially from the outside. The central dynamic is the development of capitalism, understood in terms of the laws (or tendencies) governing its development and involving certain "needs" that come to be met by the noncapitalist modes of production—for instance, a need for a large pool of landless laborers. The development of the noncapitalist modes of production is explained in terms of their ability to satisfy the needs of capitalism. In turn, the development of the capitalist mode of production is understood to be enabled or hindered in terms of the ability of the noncapitalist modes of production to satisfy capitalism's posited needs.

It can be anticipated, then, that a major controversy resulting from such investigations into the articulation between the capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production has concerned the "needs" of capitalism during the course of reinforcing, using, and eventually supplanting noncapitalism. On one side, there are theorists who tend to stress the unchanging process of capitalist development.⁶² Capitalism is inherently expansive according to these accounts; its internal dynamic forces it at all stages to engulf and inevitably destroy all noncapitalist forms of production. This conception of capitalist expansion results in a single general theory of the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production. On the other side of the controversy, some argue that the capitalist mode of production in-

volves different problems and contradictions according to its various forms and stages of development.⁶³ Therefore, the articulation between the capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production is founded on a changing pattern of capitalist expansion. For example, according to Bradby, "capitalism has different needs of precapitalist economies at different stages of development, which arise from specific historical circumstance, e.g., raw materials, land, labor-power, and at times of crisis, markets."⁶⁴ As a result of this latter mode of analysis, capitalism is considered inherently expansive, but there is no general theory of the forms of the system of relations between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production.

Whether or not the stress is on the changing nature of capitalist expansion, the general conclusion of the articulation of MOP theorists is that the development of capitalism on a world scale involves, first, the creation and maintenance and, then, the breakdown of noncapitalist modes of production. However, at the same time that noncapitalist forms of production are understood to be dominated and at least tendentially supplanted by capitalism, an additional conclusion of the work of the articulation of MOP theorists is that the full, nondistorted development of the capitalist mode of production in the underdeveloped countries is itself blocked by its dependent relation to capitalism in the developed nations.

Thus, underdevelopment and dependency have somewhat different meanings in this framework compared to what we have seen in the case of Frank. For the articulation of MOP theorists, underdevelopment is caused by the persistence of precapitalist modes of production as they are reproduced in their articulation with the dominant capitalist mode of production. Full-fledged capitalist development is itself arrested by relations of dependency between core and periphery: On the one hand, the peripheral capitalist mode of production is imposed from the outside in the midst of preexisting noncapitalist modes of production, not a direct outgrowth of a Western European-like feudalism. The implication is that Western European feudalism provided a better "breeding ground" for capitalist development than did the noncapitalist modes of production that preexisted or that were subsequently created by colonial expansion in peripheral social formations. On the other hand, once in place, the peripheral capitalist mode of production is conceived to be reproduced in a dependent status vis-à-vis the capitalist mode of production in the center.

There has been an additional concern in the various attempts to analyze the articulation of MOP. It involves the thesis of the continued coexistence of the capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production and the portended eventual demise of those noncapitalist modes of production. According to Bradby, "the establishment of capitalism in a social formation necessarily implies the transformation, and in some sense the destruction of formerly dominant modes of production."⁶⁵ It is generally accepted that the societies or social formations of peripheral countries comprise both capitalist and

noncapitalist modes of production at least at some stage in their history. Theorists differ, however, as to the manner and cause of the destruction of the noncapitalist modes of production. Are they destined to disappear because of pressures induced by the coexisting capitalist mode of production, or will their own developmental dynamic cause their destruction?

This debate parallels the earlier transition debate between Dobb and Sweezy over whether the demise of feudalism in Western Europe was caused by primarily internal factors (Dobb) or external factors (Sweezy). Wolpe formulates this distinction in the context of the articulation of modes of production in peripheral social formations by noting that "it is one thing to argue that precapitalist relations of production may be transformed into capitalist relations; it is quite another to assume that this is both an inevitable and necessary effect of the CMP [capitalist mode of production]."⁶⁶ In general, the dynamic of peripheral social formations that comprise both capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production has been analyzed in terms of the external relations—conflicts, tensions, etc.—among these modes of production. Social change is understood to occur as one mode of production, generally the capitalist mode of production, grows at the expense of other, noncapitalist modes of production. As a result, the sources of change internal to each mode of production have received scant attention.

However this controversy is resolved, the general thrust of the literature has been to argue that although these peripheral social formations comprise both capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production, the arrival of the capitalist mode of production from outside stamps these societies with its unique mark. The logic of articulation tends to be analyzed in terms of the functional needs of the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production. Thus, we have Quijano's characterization of this articulation as a "combination of capitalist and precapitalist relations of production, under the hegemony of the first and serving its interests. The movement of the whole configuration is directed by the first and, from this point of view, it is *fundamentally* capitalist but not homogeneously capitalist."⁶⁷

To appreciate the appearance and further elaboration of the articulation of MOP approach, it is helpful to note the critical tension that exists between this approach and other frameworks of analysis. The articulation of MOP position in some ways agrees with, and at the same time is quite critical of, other frameworks in regard to certain key points. It has already been stated above that this approach was in part a response to Frank's original formulation of Dependency Theory in which peripheral societies were characterized as capitalist from the time they were first inserted into what he termed the capitalist world economy. In contrast to Frank's seeing capitalism everywhere, the articulation of MOP theorists have focused on the continued existence of various noncapitalist modes of production and their articulation with the capitalist mode of production. However, they have also taken a page from Frank's book by insisting that the capitalist mode of production was

originally introduced from outside the periphery and that it continues to take its dynamic from the capitalist mode of production in the center. In this sense, the articulation of capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production in the developing countries is a different formulation of the original notion of dependency. As Foster-Carter has stated it, "the 'history of capital itself' continues to be 'written outside such social formations'."⁶⁸

The articulation of MOP approach also shares with Frank and the remainder of the dependency theory school a criticism of the orthodox "dualist" conception of the developing countries. Arrighi, for example, has analyzed what orthodox economists understand to be the labor surplus economy (for instance, the Lewis model) as a *product* of capitalist development, not as some original state.⁶⁹ However, his criticism is distanced from that of Frank in the sense that Arrighi reconceptualizes what others consider to be dualism as a structured combination of capitalism and noncapitalism, as an articulated combination of modes of production.

Not surprisingly, a traditional interpretation of the Marxist theory of development has also been the object of criticism in the work of the articulation of MOP theorists. Two aspects of this critique deserve at least brief mention. First, many of the articulation of MOP theorists have argued against the notion of a necessary or inevitable succession of modes of production.⁷⁰ Thus, they react against the mechanistic-deterministic tendency often found in some traditional Marxist analyses that hold that there is a unique path of development for all countries. Articulation of MOP theorists maintain that the transition to capitalism in peripheral societies has noncapitalist origins different from those involved in the transition in Western Europe. This means that there is no single succession of stages of development in all countries.⁷¹

The criticism of traditional Marxist theories of development made by the articulation of MOP theorists often has a second aspect. The question here is whether the transition to capitalism in peripheral societies is fundamentally distinct from the transitions that have occurred elsewhere, especially in Western Europe. The traditional Marxist answer is taken to be that there is no fundamental distinction to be drawn here. The articulation of MOP theorists, on the other hand, argue that something different has been occurring in the peripheral transition to the capitalist mode of production. In particular, the development of capitalism in the periphery is seen as an *uneven* process taking place over an *extended* period of time. As we mentioned above in relation to Rey, the assumption here is that the European transition was, in contrast, relatively smooth and rapid. This attempt to analyze peripheral capitalist development as unlike the supposedly smooth, short development of capitalism in Western Europe is then used by Rey to argue that violence and other aspects of formal colonialism are inherent in the development of the capitalist mode of production in the periphery.

While critics of the articulation of MOP approach can agree that the development of capitalism in the peripheral countries is uneven and pro-

longed, they can also point-out that it is evident that the transition to capitalism during, say, the period 1100–1850 in Western Europe was neither smooth nor of short duration. In support of their position, these critics can point out that the work of historians as diverse as Dobb and Pirenne has demonstrated the extended, often violent nature of the Western European transition to capitalism.⁷² Therefore, without denying that there are certainly differences between the transitions to capitalism in the so-called core and periphery countries, critics of the articulation of MOP approach can maintain that it is probably mistaken to attempt to distinguish these transitions on the basis of their relative unevenness or the length of time over which they have been occurring.

In summary, the articulation of MOP theorists construct their understanding of the developing countries in terms of a system of relations between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production. In particular, the concepts of dependency and underdevelopment are taken over from Dependency Theory and reinterpreted as the persistence of noncapitalist modes of production and the less than full development of the capitalist mode of production in that context. The articulation of MOP approach differs from specifically Frank-like interpretations of Dependency Theory, then, because of the focus on the relationship between capitalism and noncapitalism within the periphery. However, it still takes as given the notion, shared by Dependency Theory, that there are fundamentally different schemes of development that define a core and periphery of a world economy.

Peripheral Modes of Production

A second approach within the MOP school criticizes the specific set of concepts of modes of production that the articulation of MOP theorists have tended to use in their analyses. This alternative approach has sought to specify the concepts of "peripheral modes of production" or "colonial modes of production," a set of *sui generis* modes of production that are said to correspond better than the "classical" concepts of capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production to the conditions of underdevelopment and dependency in the peripheral countries of the world economy.

The modes of production picked out by these new concepts are considered to be qualitatively distinct from those that are used to analyze the development of capitalism in Western Europe and elsewhere. The operative assumption is that the forms of development in the core and periphery are fundamentally different and that different concepts must be used to understand these different forms of development. According to the peripheral MOP theorists, the fact that colonialism changed the precolonial pattern of development—in particular, the precolonial modes of production—in the colonized countries means that what is required is a separate set of concepts

of modes of production with which to analyze their colonial and postcolonial experiences. This argument is best summarized by C. F. S. Cardoso:

The specificity of internal colonial structures and of their historical genesis implies the inadequacy of such categories as "feudalism" to explain them. What is required is the elaboration of a theory of *colonial modes of production*, starting with the notion that such structures are *specific and dependent*.⁷³

Here, then, the concept of mode of production is modified by the notion of dependency to produce a framework of analysis based on a set of concepts of peripheral or colonial modes of production. The presupposition seems to be that a mode of production that is affected to some more or less significant degrees by conditions external to the social formation where that mode of production is located is fundamentally different from an "independent" mode of production. For example, according to this approach, the existence of slavery in Brazil during the colonial period would make it a different mode of production, by virtue of its colonial ties with Portugal, from the slave mode of production of ancient Rome. Thus, despite what might at first appear as important similarities between the two cases, different concepts are needed in each case to conduct a proper analysis. This presumption that external influences serve as the criterion for a separate set of concepts of peripheral modes of production is also the origin of the well known Alavi-Banaji-et al. debate on India.⁷⁴

Again, a more concrete example will help to illustrate this particular version of the MOP interpretation. Returning to the case of Peru, it will be remembered that our hypothetical articulation of MOP analysis utilized "classical" concepts of modes of production and conceptualized dependency in terms of the specific articulation among these modes of production. The present, alternative approach would drop the notion of different modes of production articulated in a single social formation. Rather, it would emphasize the colonial origins and general dependent nature of economic and social relations in Peru. Indeed, all of those relations that would be picked out by the articulation of MOP theorists as elements of the "primitive communal," "feudal," or "capitalist" modes of production would be understood as different aspects of a single peripheral mode of production, as distinct social relations that were specific to the peripheral status of the Peruvian social formation. It follows that one would not expect this peripheral mode of production to develop along the same path as the classical modes. This peripheral mode of production would generate a path of development fundamentally different from what would have existed in a nondependent setting. In relation to our example, the role of Peru's economy as a subordinate mode of production within the world capitalist system precluded the development of capitalism in Peru in the same form that it had emerged from nondependent, noncapital-

ist modes of production in the core countries. The peripheral status of this mode of production, not the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production, explains dependency and underdevelopment in Peru.

It is interesting to note that the advocates of these concepts of *sui generis* modes of production for analyzing the developing countries tend to accept the use of the classical concepts of the modes of production of slavery, capitalism, etc. for the countries of the core. However, it would be difficult to argue that the modes of production of the colonizing countries, especially the capitalist mode of production, were less affected by colonialism than those of the colonized countries. Was the development of capitalism in Britain any less conditioned by the existence of colonial ties with India than the existing modes of production in India itself? If not, then why, on their theoretical assumptions, should the classical concepts be thought to be applicable to core countries across the precolonial, colonial, and postcolonial periods? And if these concepts of modes of production are not applicable across periods, how do we demarcate new and changing modes of production? There seems to be a problem of concept specification here.

This attempt to draw a sharp distinction between peripheral and classical modes of production does make it quite evident, however, that the focus of this form of analysis is on the external relations of domination that shape and otherwise determine what are conceived to be the subordinate modes of production of the peripheral countries. In this regard, then, the work of the peripheral MOP theorists is continuous with the earlier work of Frank. They agree with Frank that the dependency condition of the developing world is a result of the domination of economic forces (for the most part) outside the developing countries themselves. Where they differ from Frank is over how best to analyze the internal structures of dependency, whether, for instance, underdevelopment should be analyzed in terms of capitalist relations or whether it should be seen as the result of the logic of development of a different, peripheral mode of production.

Internationalization of Capital

The third major approach to the MOP analysis of dependency and underdevelopment focuses on the internationalization of capital as part of a world system that is to be understood in terms of the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production. In many ways, Frank's most recent works on "world accumulation" reflect this new focus.⁷⁵ Attention is shifted away from the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production and away from the specification of specific peripheral modes of production to an analysis of the structure and logic of development of the capitalist mode of production itself. According to the internationalization of capital theorists, the other two MOP approaches do not pay sufficient attention to the "real" dynamic determining world development, i.e., the capitalist mode of produc-

tion. This mode of analysis presumes the dominance of the capitalist mode of production within the international economy; that is, it implies that the fundamental structure of the world economy is that of the capitalist mode of production and that the logic of world development reflects the laws governing that mode of production. In this way, the internationalization of the capitalist mode of production becomes the new demiurge, propelling the world economy forward and driving a larger and larger wedge between core and periphery.

This focus on the structure and effects of the capitalist mode of production on a world scale may be seen as either a critique or an extension of the two other MOP approaches surveyed in previous sections. It represents a critique to the extent that noncapitalist and peripheral modes of production are replaced by a single global capitalist mode of production. For example, units of production that would be analyzed as feudal or peripheral in the other MOP frameworks would be placed inside a single process of capitalist accumulation by the internationalization of capital theorists. On the other hand, it represents an extension insofar as some theorists argue that the historical period when the other modes of production approaches were applicable has passed. There may have been and probably were either noncapitalist or peripheral modes of production at one time in the developing countries, so they might argue, but these modes of production have been supplanted by a single capitalist mode of production on a world scale. Interpreted thusly, the various MOP approaches would represent a historical sequence at the level of theory that corresponds to the stages of development of the world economy.

However understood, whether as a break from or an extension of the other MOP frameworks, the basic unit of analysis of the internationalization of capital approach is the structure and movement of the capitalist mode of production. Partly in response to the debate between theoretical approaches that argued over the predominance of circulation (Frank) versus that of production (Laclau), the internationalization of capital theorists have defined capitalism in terms of a particular interpretation of Marx's three circuits of commodity-capital, money-capital, and productive-capital. In other words, capitalist production is conceived of as a *unity* of production and circulation. The focus is, in particular, on the global nature of these circuits as they transcend the confines of the nation-state. The symbol of this global process of accumulation is, of course, the transnational or multinational corporation. These corporations embody the logic of the third stage of the international expansion of the capitalist mode of production, intertwining the various parts of the world economy into a single entity and subordinating these parts to the needs of capitalist accumulation.

Within this framework, how is what appears to some as the articulation between capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production to be understood? Barkin responds:

We can examine the problems of the relationship between peasant and capitalist production by determining if and how surplus value is generated and the ways in which it is appropriated by different segments of the capitalist class. In this way, the complex productive structures within individual countries can be analyzed in terms of their particular contributions to the global process of articulation.⁷⁶

The articulation *between modes of production* within peripheral social formations is replaced by a notion of *articulation within the capitalist mode of production* itself. According to Palloix,

this new type of articulation characterizes the different chains of dependence in the self-expansion of capital, in particular with the underdeveloped countries, which is no longer an articulation of the capitalist mode of production at the centre with other modes of production, but an articulation within the world CMP [capitalist mode of production] itself, among differing processes of self-expansion of capital and increasingly accentuated differentiation of this expansion as between the centre and the periphery.⁷⁷

To return once again to our Peruvian illustration, the internationalization of capital theorists would tend to explain Peruvian development in terms of the logic of the development of the capitalist mode of production on a world scale. No capitalist production was initiated within the Peruvian social formation during the colonial and immediate postcolonial periods because the global expansion of capitalism took the form of the extension of predominantly commercial relations. That is, Peru was a site for exports (of gold, sugar, etc.) to the core countries. In a second stage, the export of money-capital financed a certain development of infrastructure and involved Peru in a web of international debt relations. In neither of these stages was capitalist production itself initiated in Peru. Only with the internationalization of the circuit of productive-capital did Peru embark on a path of capitalist development *per se*. For some, it would be described as dependent capitalism, Peru occupying a subordinate position in the international division of labor; underdevelopment would be reproduced as a result. For others, this capitalist development, although incipient, would be characterized as a break from dependency, which was characteristic of the noncapitalist phases, and thus the end of underdevelopment. In both cases, the explanation of Peruvian (under)development is based on the effects of the development of the capitalist mode of production on a world scale.

Thus, while they all focus on the internationalization of the various circuits of capital, and therefore of the capitalist mode of production itself, the various internationalization of capital theorists reach different conclusions concerning the continued existence of dependency and underdevelop-

ment. Basically, as exemplified in the preceding example, the positions are two. On the one hand, it is argued that the new international division of labor produced by the internationalization of the capitalist mode of production serves to perpetuate conditions of underdevelopment and the dependency of the peripheral countries on the core countries (where the multinational corporations are based).⁷⁸ Underdevelopment and dependency are no longer associated with the persistence of noncapitalist modes of productions, as they are with the articulation of MOP theorists, or with the dependent status of developing countries, as in the peripheral MOP approach; they are effects internal to the capitalist mode of production itself.

On the other hand, the analyses of, for example, Cypher and, even more so, Warren argue that underdevelopment is associated only with the continued existence of noncapitalist modes of production and that these are entirely supplanted by the expansion of the capitalist mode of production.⁷⁹ The expansion of the capitalist mode of production on a world scale, particularly within what others would term the periphery, induces a process of unqualified capitalist development. Here the break with the conclusions of Frank and other theorists of the "development of underdevelopment" or "dependent development" is virtually complete.

Even many of those who assume the first position and choose to retain terms such as "dependency" and "underdevelopment" tend to analyze the development of so-called Third World countries solely in terms of the logic of expansion of the capitalist mode of production. A typical statement is the following:

International markets and economic power structures are increasingly determining the individual decisions made in ever more isolated parts of national economies, even when "noncapitalist" productive groups are involved, such as peasant producers in many Third World economies.⁸⁰

Two factors appear to be lost here. Any dynamic inherent in the particular economic structure, capitalist or otherwise, of a developing country is overlooked in favor of international forces. Second, noncapitalist modes of production recede into the background or disappear completely; thus, we are faced with the collapse of the notion of articulation and an ironic return to Frank's original position, this time in terms of "seeing the capitalist mode of production everywhere."

V. AMIN

The various conceptualizations of dependency and underdevelopment analyzed in previous sections are synthesized and recast as a distinct version of Dependency Theory in the work of Samir Amin. Basically, Amin combines notions of the world capitalist system, the articulation of modes of produc-

tion, and the internationalization of capital with a theory of unequal exchange. The result is a theory of development in which the core and periphery are conceived as complementary opposites within a world capitalist social formation. This relation between core and periphery promotes capitalist development in the former while blocking the same path of development in the latter. This conception of dichotomous economic development serves, in turn, as the basis of what Amin considers to be the central political contradiction of the world capitalist system.

Amin begins his theory of development with the presumption of a world capitalist system that is divided into two fundamentally distinct parts—a core and a periphery—that are functionally related. In a manner obviously consistent with Frank's approach, he argues that "the structures of the periphery are shaped so as to meet the needs of accumulation at the center, that is, provided that the development of the center engenders and maintains the underdevelopment of the periphery."⁸¹

Going beyond Frank, however, Amin realizes the importance of providing a more detailed analysis of the internal structures of the countries of the periphery. Amin shares with the articulation of modes of production theorists a structural explanation of the underdevelopment of the periphery in terms of the system of relations between the capitalist and various noncapitalist modes of production. In general, for Amin, "social formations are . . . concrete, organized structures that are marked by a dominant mode of production and the articulation around this of a complex of modes of production that are subordinate to it."⁸²

The particular social formations of the world capitalist economy are analyzed in terms of the dominance of the capitalist mode of production and the subordinate existence of various noncapitalist modes of production. Finally, Amin follows the internationalization of capital theorists in analyzing the various parts of his world economy in terms of the globalization of the capitalist mode of production.

The predominance of the capitalist mode of production is also expressed on another plane. It constitutes a world system in which all formations, central and peripheral alike, are arranged in a single system, organized and hierarchical.⁸³

These three notions (world capitalist system, articulation of modes of production, and internationalization of the capitalist modes of production) are combined, as we show below, with a theory of unequal exchange to constitute Amin's particular theory of blocked development in the periphery.

Amin's work is characterized, then, by this synthesis of other Dependency Theory approaches to produce an alternative model of dependency and underdevelopment. His work is also characterized by the importance it places on history. This focus on history is thematic in at least two senses. First, much

ment. Basically, as exemplified in the preceding example, the positions are two. On the one hand, it is argued that the new international division of labor produced by the internationalization of the capitalist mode of production serves to perpetuate conditions of underdevelopment and the dependency of the peripheral countries on the core countries (where the multinational corporations are based).⁷⁸ Underdevelopment and dependency are no longer associated with the persistence of noncapitalist modes of production, as they are with the articulation of MOP theorists, or with the dependent status of developing countries, as in the peripheral MOP approach; they are effects internal to the capitalist mode of production itself.

On the other hand, the analyses of, for example, Cypher and, even more so, Warren argue that underdevelopment is associated only with the continued existence of noncapitalist modes of production and that these are entirely supplanted by the expansion of the capitalist mode of production.⁷⁹ The expansion of the capitalist mode of production on a world scale, particularly within what others would term the periphery, induces a process of unqualified capitalist development. Here the break with the conclusions of Frank and other theorists of the "development of underdevelopment" or "dependent development" is virtually complete.

Even many of those who assume the first position and choose to retain terms such as "dependency" and "underdevelopment" tend to analyze the development of so-called Third World countries solely in terms of the logic of expansion of the capitalist mode of production. A typical statement is the following:

International markets and economic power structures are increasingly determining the individual decisions made in ever more isolated parts of national economies, even when "noncapitalist" productive groups are involved, such as peasant producers in many Third World economies.⁸⁰

Two factors appear to be lost here. Any dynamic inherent in the particular economic structure, capitalist or otherwise, of a developing country is overlooked in favor of international forces. Second, noncapitalist modes of production recede into the background or disappear completely; thus, we are faced with the collapse of the notion of articulation and an ironic return to Frank's original position, this time in terms of "seeing the capitalist mode of production everywhere."

V. AMIN

The various conceptualizations of dependency and underdevelopment analyzed in previous sections are synthesized and recast as a distinct version of Dependency Theory in the work of Samir Amin. Basically, Amin combines notions of the world capitalist system, the articulation of modes of produc-

tion, and the internationalization of capital with a theory of unequal exchange. The result is a theory of development in which the core and periphery are conceived as complementary opposites within a world capitalist social formation. This relation between core and periphery promotes capitalist development in the former while blocking the same path of development in the latter. This conception of dichotomous economic development serves, in turn, as the basis of what Amin considers to be the central political contradiction of the world capitalist system.

Amin begins his theory of development with the presumption of a world capitalist system that is divided into two fundamentally distinct parts—a core and a periphery—that are functionally related. In a manner obviously consistent with Frank's approach, he argues that "the structures of the periphery are shaped so as to meet the needs of accumulation at the center, that is, provided that the development of the center engenders and maintains the underdevelopment of the periphery."⁸¹

Going beyond Frank, however, Amin realizes the importance of providing a more detailed analysis of the internal structures of the countries of the periphery. Amin shares with the articulation of modes of production theorists a structural explanation of the underdevelopment of the periphery in terms of the system of relations between the capitalist and various noncapitalist modes of production. In general, for Amin, "social formations are . . . concrete, organized structures that are marked by a dominant mode of production and the articulation around this of a complex of modes of production that are subordinate to it."⁸²

The particular social formations of the world capitalist economy are analyzed in terms of the dominance of the capitalist mode of production and the subordinate existence of various noncapitalist modes of production. Finally, Amin follows the internationalization of capital theorists in analyzing the various parts of his world economy in terms of the globalization of the capitalist mode of production.

The predominance of the capitalist mode of production is also expressed on another plane. It constitutes a world system in which all formations, central and peripheral alike, are arranged in a single system, organized and hierarchical.⁸³

These three notions (world capitalist system, articulation of modes of production, and internationalization of the capitalist modes of production) are combined, as we show below, with a theory of unequal exchange to constitute Amin's particular theory of blocked development in the periphery.

Amin's work is characterized, then, by this synthesis of other Dependency Theory approaches to produce an alternative model of dependency and underdevelopment. His work is also characterized by the importance it places on history. This focus on history is thematic in at least two senses. First, much

of Amin's published work—in fact, some would argue, the best of that work—consists of historical writing. His accounts of the different paths to capitalism in the social formations of the periphery, especially in Africa, are among the best available.⁸⁴ Second, Amin conceives of history as providing the “correct perspective” for carrying out the analysis of the developing countries. The terms of his own particular analysis are said to correspond to a perspective that emerges from the history of the developing countries.⁸⁵ Theories that have been generated from perspectives that represent the histories of the core countries—in particular, neoclassical and traditional Marxist theories of development—do not correspond, according to Amin, to the reality of the developing countries.

The basic terms of Amin's version of Dependency Theory are by now quite familiar: Concepts of modes of production, social formation, center, periphery, and the accumulation of capital seem to be borrowed more or less intact from other theorists and used to construct a theoretical model. This model is then deployed to explain the process of development of the world capitalist system. The particular use of such concepts would appear to make Amin's mode of analysis a straightforward Marxist one. However, at least two difficulties arise in this connection. On the one hand, commentators have noted the relative lack of precision in Amin's use of these concepts. Explicit definitions of concepts are rarely offered and, because of their shifting meanings from passage to passage, implicit definitions are difficult to construct. This is especially troublesome given the vastly different meanings of such concepts throughout the Marxian tradition. Thus, it is difficult to pinpoint exactly which interpretation of the concepts and method of Marxist theory is at work in Amin's writings. On the other hand, Amin self-consciously distances his analysis from that of Marx, if only because the latter's theory was limited by his perspective which, in turn, corresponded to the historical period in which he wrote. In this vein, Amin writes that

in fact, the monopolies, the rise of which Marx could not imagine, were to prevent any local capitalism that might arise from competing. The development of capitalism in the periphery was to remain extraverted, based on the external market, and could therefore not lead to a full flowering of the capitalist mode of production in the periphery.⁸⁶

The central element of Amin's model of the world economy is the relationship between the two groups of core and periphery countries as complementary opposites. These two poles are created by the history of capitalist expansion from the core. According to Amin, a core and periphery exist at all of the three stages into which he periodizes capitalist development: mercantilist, premonopoly/competitive, and monopoly/imperialist capitalism. However, the dichotomy becomes “hardened” in the third, imperialist stage:

From that point on, no country of the periphery or semiperiphery is capable of joining the core.

The reason for this hardening of the core and periphery is that Amin considers these two parts of the world economy to be governed by fundamentally different laws of development. The contrast is between *autocentric* and *extraverted* accumulation. “I maintain that the dynamic of the core is autonomous, that the periphery adjusts to it, and that the functions the periphery fulfills differ from one stage to another.”⁸⁷

Amin is quite specific in stating that autocentric accumulation does not mean autarchy. Rather, autocentric development is a result of the dynamic of development originating in the core itself. The nature of development in the core is such that it determines its own development as well as that of the periphery. The key relation making for a pattern of autocentric accumulation in the center is the balance between increases in productivity and wages.⁸⁸ This results in an expansion of the internal market and the balanced development of industries specialized in the production of both producer and consumer goods (or, in Amin's terminology, Departments I and II). This balance between changes in productivity and wages in the center is also supported by surplus transfers from the periphery on the basis of unequal exchange.

The periphery, on the other hand, is barred from achieving such a balance. Its pattern of accumulation is characterized as extraverted, deformed, and dependent. The pattern of accumulation is fundamentally different in the periphery where the coexistence of capitalist and noncapitalist modes of production means that there is no necessary relation between the levels of productivity and wages. Increases in productivity, even in the “modern” export sector, are not translated into corresponding improvements in wages because of the existence of a Lewis-like surplus labor force. The sources of this “surplus labor” are those parts of the economy in which noncapitalist relations are still strong. This imbalance between productivity and wages leaves the domestic market “limited and distorted,” so that the key result is a link between production in the export sector and luxury goods consumption.

According to Amin, the peripheral economy is considered to be “disarticulated.”⁸⁹ It should be emphasized that this concept of disarticulation is quite different from what it might mean for the articulation of modes of production theorists. “Articulation” and “disarticulation” in Amin's sense refer to the economic conditions that give rise to a balance or imbalance between changes in productivity and wages. The result of disarticulation, then, is that the possibility of autocentric accumulation in the periphery is blocked.

The three main “distortions” of the periphery with respect to the development of capitalism in the core that derive from this model of disarticulation concern the main sectors of economic activity. The peripheral economy is biased toward export production, service activities, and, in the choice of

branches of industry proper, toward light industry with modern technology. This pattern of investment or accumulation reproduces what Amin calls the "marginalization of the masses," a level of unemployment that ensures a minimum wage in all sectors far below the level of productivity. This minimum wage serves, in turn, as the basis of a restricted internal market. The final result of this fundamentally distinct pattern of accumulation in the periphery is that development is blocked.

None of the features that define the structure of the periphery is thus weakened as economic growth proceeds: on the contrary, these features are accentuated. Whereas at the center growth means development, making the economy more integral, in the periphery growth does not mean development, for it disarticulates the economy—it is only a "development of underdevelopment."⁹⁰

Amin's conceptions of dependency and underdevelopment are thus quite clear: Underdevelopment means both that noncapitalist modes of production are reproduced and that the expansion of the capitalist mode of production is distorted in the periphery of the world economy. Insofar as these conditions are maintained, they continue to serve as the basis for the dependency of the peripheral countries on the core countries. In the end, the periphery does not have the power to control its own development.

The key mechanism in Amin's model whereby the two patterns of auto-centric and dependent development are reproduced is the process of unequal exchange between core and periphery. Amin takes over and subsequently modifies Emmanuel's original theory of unequal exchange.⁹¹ Emmanuel takes as given and bases his analysis on differences in real wages between center and periphery. Amin argues that the essential condition for unequal exchange is not merely wage differentials, but rather that these real wage differences are larger than productivity differences. The result, however, is the same as that in Emmanuel's model: The prices (of production) at which the goods of the center and periphery exchange are such that a surplus is transferred to the former from the latter. This surplus transfer means that there is an external drain on internally generated investment funds and the reproduction of a limited internal market. These results then serve to reproduce the general conditions of accumulation that, in turn, give rise to the wage-productivity differentials that are the basis of unequal exchange.

Given this relationship between the phenomenon of unequal exchange and the conditions that give rise to unequal exchange, a question immediately arises concerning the pattern of cause and effect between international prices and unequal wage levels. Amin responds:

The question is pointless. Inequality in wages, due to historical reasons (the difference between social formations), constitutes the basis of spe-

cialization and a system of international prices that perpetuate this inequality.⁹²

That is, once some initial wage-productivity differences between the core and periphery historically emerge, a pattern of unequal exchange is produced whereby these initial differences continue to be reproduced over time.

Amin's theory of unequal exchange, like that of Emmanuel and others, has elicited comments and criticisms from many quarters.⁹³ The most damaging criticism to his general model of the unidirectional transfer of a surplus from the periphery to the core concerns the real wage-productivity disparity between center and periphery. According to Amin, this transfer of surplus requires that production in the periphery be based on a higher rate of exploitation than that in the center. Amin's own equations bear this out. If this is so, critics respond, why is it the case, assuming as Amin does the full mobility of capital, that all production in the core is not transferred to the periphery? Amin's answer is twofold. First, capitalists respond to different profit rates, not to different rates of exploitation. And since Amin's model of unequal exchange assumes the existence of a single, general rate of profit across all industries, there is no apparent reason for capital to be shifted from the core to the periphery. Second, Amin has argued that the absence of a large domestic market in the periphery keeps industry in the core countries. This second response is less than satisfactory because there is no reason that the location of production must coincide with the location of the final market. His own assumption of the existence of international exchange shows this.

His first answer, concerning the difference between profitability and exploitation, is also beset with difficulties. On the one hand, Marx's theory of prices of production and a general rate of profit, which Amin says that he adopts, was part of Marx's attempt to analyze the dynamic nature of capitalist competition.⁹⁴ Marx used the concept of price of production as a *hypothetical equilibrium* to illustrate the ceaseless *movement* in the direction of the formation of a general rate of profit. Flows of capital between industries in response to unequal rates of profit so change the conditions of profitability that the hypothetical general rate of profit itself changes. This general rate of profit can be thought of as a shifting equilibrium, an elusive goal that is never reached. Its only purpose in volume 3 of *Capital* is to illustrate the dynamics of capitalist competition by momentarily abstracting from that movement. On the other hand, even assuming a general rate of profit *across* industries does not mean that the rate of profit is equal *within* each industry. The existence of a range of "efficiencies" among firms that make up each industry at any point in time implies that there will be a similar range of profit rates among those firms.⁹⁵ The competitive dynamic that forces less efficient producers within an industry to innovate, e.g., by moving to a location where rates of exploitation are supposed to be higher (in the periphery, according to Amin),

is not brought to a standstill even if a general rate of profit is imposed across industries.

In general, then, the existence at a point in time of a set of prices does not ensure that the underlying conditions that give rise to those prices will be reproduced over time. In fact, the opposite conclusion is more likely, namely, that the existence of unequal prices of production will cause movements of capital within and between industries so that the conditions of profitability within those industries are changed. The nature of these changes in the conditions of profitability cannot, of course, be predetermined. However, there is no reason, even on the basis of Amin's assumptions, for such capital movements to unilaterally promote capitalist development in one set of countries (the core) and prevent such development in another group of countries (the periphery). Unequal capitalist development in both core and periphery, rather than the "development of underdevelopment," would be the more likely result.

Amin's model of the world capitalist economy starts with a fundamental distinction between core and peripheral patterns of accumulation. This relation of complementary opposites is reproduced over time by the mechanism of unequal exchange. The result, then, of Amin's economic analysis is that the development of capitalism on a world scale is radically dichotomized: While continuing apace in the core countries, the development of capitalism is substantially blocked in the peripheral countries. This underdevelopment means, for Amin, that noncapitalist modes of production continue to exist in the periphery and that the peripheral capitalist mode of production cannot serve as the basis for a process of autocentric development.

This model of economic development (and underdevelopment) serves, in turn, as the basis for Amin's analysis of what he considers to be the central contradiction of the world capitalist system, to wit, the conflict between what Amin calls the world bourgeoisie and the world proletariat. The implicit notion of contradiction in Amin's work is that of a pair of opposing forces, each of which is generated by complementary processes of accumulation within a single world capitalist system. The central nucleus of the world bourgeoisie is located in the core countries. Because of the existence of "superexploitation," within the periphery, Amin finds the central nucleus of the world proletariat there. Amin explains the superexploitation of the peripheral proletariat in the following manner:

[Unequal exchange] means that the bourgeoisie of the center, the only one that exists on the scale of the world system, exploits the proletariat everywhere, at the center and at the periphery, but that it exploits the proletariat of the periphery even more brutally, and that this is possible because the objective mechanism upon which is based the unity that links it to its own proletariat, in an autocentric economy, and which restricts the degree of exploitation it carries out at the center, does not function at the extraverted periphery.⁹⁶

According to Amin, the relationship between capitalists and workers in the core countries is characterized by a "social democratic alliance." Capitalists are said to benefit from the continued existence of profitable production while workers share both in increases in productivity at home and in transfer of surplus from the periphery. Workers in the periphery are subject to superexploitation. Therefore, the principal set of opposing interests that is the basis of the contradiction of the world system is between the world bourgeoisie (of the core) and the world proletariat (of the periphery).

Amin's framework of analysis has, of course, not escaped the criticisms of writers both inside and outside the Dependency Theory tradition.⁹⁷ His most recent, comprehensive reply, responding to the critical commentaries of Warren, Smith, and Brewer, serves to highlight the main elements of his interpretation of Dependency Theory.⁹⁸ Amin's points are basically three. First, he seeks to clear up what he considers a misinterpretation of his notion of the blocked development of the periphery. "Blocking" does not mean stagnation or the absence of change. Rather, capitalist development in the periphery is considered to be blocked because it "does not reproduce the model of that of the developed world."⁹⁹ What this means for Amin is that peripheral development is subject to periods of growth and crisis because of an external impetus, and that this uneven process continues to create inequality in the distribution of income.

Amin's critics would be hard-pressed to disagree with the notions that the developing countries continue to experience income inequalities and that economic crises are transmitted internationally. However, it is not clear how these phenomena serve to block peripheral development or serve as the basis of his radical dichotomy between the patterns of accumulation in the core and periphery. What this means is that Amin's conclusion concerning the complementary and opposite nature of the relationship between the core and periphery depends crucially on his presumption of such a dichotomy as the starting point of his analysis. Amin begins his investigation with, and thus ends that investigation with, the division of the world capitalist system into two groups of core and periphery countries.

This is Amin's second point. All attempts to deny, as a point of departure, this core-periphery dichotomy are fundamentally mistaken: "[T]he 'theory' which rejects the analysis of capitalist expansion in terms of centre and periphery stops at the threshold of the real questions."¹⁰⁰ This is not just one among other entry-points into an analysis of development for Amin, one which has its attendant consequences for the subsequent conclusions of that analysis. Rather, it is the entry point which is determined by "history." In this sense, Amin is merely reasserting that one of the defining characteristics of Dependency Theory—the presumption that there is a world system divided into a core and periphery—is also his and that this starting point is the correct one to analyze dependency and underdevelopment.

Finally, Amin reiterates, in the face of the protestations of his critics, the basic theses of his previous analyses. Unequal exchange, the social democratic

alliance between workers and capitalists in the core, etc. remain his basic arguments. He also redefines the relationship of his framework of analysis to that of other versions of Dependency Theory. On the one hand, the modes of production debate is not "decisive" because it avoids an analysis of the insertion of noncapitalist modes of production into a "world system which can only be termed capitalist."¹⁰¹ On the other hand, the work of Frank and Wallerstein continues to be valid. In particular, Amin reaffirms that "the development of some [countries] is the cause of the underdevelopment of others."¹⁰²

It should be relatively clear from our and other summaries of Amin's work that both the starting point and end point of Amin's analysis of the world capitalist system is the fundamental dichotomy between the modes of accumulation in the core and in the periphery. Distinct processes of accumulation are posited at the beginning of his analysis and reproduced over time, through the mechanism of unequal exchange, so that the fundamental differences between these complementary opposite forms of development are present in his conclusions. In addition, the fundamental political contradiction of the world system—between the capitalists of the center and the superexploited workers of the periphery—corresponds exactly to this economic distinction between core and periphery.

The key mechanism that is both cause and effect of this dichotomy, unequal exchange, has been called into question above. Our point is not the substantive one that unequal exchange cannot or does not take place in international trade. Rather, our criticism indicates that the existence of unequal exchange, and the accompanying flows of profits among enterprises within and between industries, cannot ensure the reproduction of the two fundamentally distinct patterns of accumulation that are presumed in Amin's analysis. In addition, it is only the presumption of this essential economic dichotomy between core and periphery that allows Amin to make the fundamental political conflict of the world system that between capitalists located in the core countries and workers located in the periphery. To so reduce the political dynamic within the world system, if such a system can be presumed at all, serves only to "forget about" the other conflicts and contradictions that emerge in the course of world development.

VI. CONCLUSION

There is a wide variety of theories that serve as alternatives to orthodox, neoclassical approaches to development. We have presented three of those theories in this chapter: the Dependency Theory of Frank (and, by extension, Wallerstein), the Modes of Production school, and the approach elaborated by Amin.

All three theoretical approaches are explicitly put forward as dependency and/or Marxian alternatives to bourgeois development theory. Using differ-

ent concepts, they arrive at conclusions in stark contrast to those put forward by bourgeois economists and other social scientists. Where bourgeois theorists see the development of capitalism as propelling a process of modernization from traditional or backward forms of economic and social organization to modern growth and development, the radical theorists see imperialist domination and exploitation. Thus, these radicals "see" a different reality in the currently less-developed or underdeveloped countries. The difference in the very names used to designate these "poor" countries by the alternative approaches—less-developed vs. dependent and/or underdeveloped—betray these different realities.

Orthodox and radical theorists arrive at different conclusions because their analyses of development start in different places; they have different conceptual "entry-points." Orthodox theorists tend to focus on individual decision-making and begin their analysis with a particular model of human behavior. In neoclassical theory, capitalist economic growth and development are understood in terms of individual utilities or preferences. Prices, the distribution of income, and all other economic phenomena are derived from this utility model of behavior. Individual utilities, taken as given within the model, are considered the principal factor determining the economic forces leading to development. From this perspective, the development of capitalism is generally understood to bring about an increase in individual freedom. This greater freedom, in turn, is seen to help guarantee the accumulation of wealth and social modernization by providing the incentives for rational market behavior. This is true for all countries in which capitalism takes root.

The radical approaches arrive at different conclusions because they start with different concepts. In the case of Frank (and Wallerstein), the circulation of commodities serves as the conceptual entry-point for the analysis of world capitalist development. Laclau and his followers begin with concepts of modes of production to describe and analyze development in the core and periphery of the world economy. Different and unequal national units within a world capitalist social formation is the starting point for Amin's theory of development. Many radicals have attempted to use all three standpoints, by synthesizing concepts of commodity and capital flows, modes of production, and the world capitalist system into a single framework of analysis. Thus, radical approaches tend to replace the model of human behavior of orthodox theory with one of a variety of different concepts (or a combination of them).

It is natural, then, that capitalist development will look very different to these radical theorists in comparison with the bourgeois outlook. Where the orthodox theorists see freedom, the radicals see unequal power relations. The orthodox notion of economic growth for all countries becomes, in radical theories, economic growth for some countries at the expense of growth for all the others. The orthodox theory of a unilinear process of development from traditional to modern societies is similarly challenged by radical theorists: Development occurs in the center while underdevelopment or depen-

dent development occurs in the periphery. In this sense, capitalism is the problem, not the solution.

These radical theories are certainly alternatives to the orthodox approach to development, both in terms of their conceptual entry-points and the conclusions they generate about the process of development. However, they share with their orthodox opposite one crucial element: They tend to reduce the analysis of development to one decisive factor. That is, just as the neoclassical conception of development explains all social phenomena in terms of a particular model of human behavior (psychological utility), the radical theories we have presented tend to explain development in terms of international commodity circulation, the mode of production, or the world capitalist social formation, respectively. The result is that quite different theories end up agreeing on the methodological point that the rest of society can be explained in terms of one essential factor. What they disagree about, then, is what the factor is.

The difficulty with all such approaches is that they attempt to reduce the explanation of a complex and diffuse phenomenon—world development in the past four hundred years—to an ultimately determining factor. One can be justifiably wary of whether any theory of this sort can provide an entirely convincing account.

Orthodox and radical approaches also share another key aspect. They are both directly and indirectly connected to political agendas. Radical theorists tend to be more upfront about their political interests. Orthodox theorists, concerned to claim the mantle of science, tend to shy away from stating explicitly the political dimensions and implications of their approach. Nonetheless, we should recognize that such contrasting theories of development will lead to significantly different consequences for the actual course of development.

NOTES

1. We would like to thank Charles Wilber, Kenneth Jameson, Vaughn McKim, and Rhoda Halperin for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this material. The research on this article was supported in part by a grant from the Institute for Scholarship in the Liberal Arts of the University of Notre Dame.
2. For three recent attempts to survey this literature, see Anthony Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980); Gabriel Palma, "Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment or a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment?," *World Development* 6 (July–August 1978): 881–924; and Keith Griffin and John Gurley, "Radical Analyses of Imperialism, the Third World, and the Transition to Socialism: A Survey Article," *Journal of Economic Literature* 23 (September 1985): 1089–1143.
3. What might be called the classic debate took place in the first decades of this century and largely involved issues of how to interpret and extend Marx's theory

to the questions of imperialism and the colonial world. The major figures included Lenin, Luxemburg, Bukharin, and Hilferding. The works listed in footnote 2 all discuss this material. Paul Baran's *The Political Economy of Growth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957) preceded Frank's work by a decade and was very influential in setting the stages for the modern debate.

4. For discussions of a more critical nature focusing in particular on methodological issues, see two essays by the authors, "A Methodological Analysis of Dependency Theory: Explanation in Andre Gunder Frank" and "Methodological Aspects of a Marxian Approach to Development: An Analysis of the Modes of Production School," both in *World Development* 14 (February 1986): 195–209 and 211–222. Some of the material in the present article has been adopted from these two essays.
5. Fernando Henrique Cardoso, it should perhaps be noted, differs somewhat from this view. See his "The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States," *Latin American Research Review* 12 (1977): 7–24.
6. Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1967, rev. ed. 1969). Frank's other major works include: *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1969); *Lumpenbourgeoisie: Lumpen-development: Dependence, Class, and Politics in Latin America* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1972); *World Accumulation 1492–1978* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1978); *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment* (New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1979); and *Critique and Anti-Critique: Essays on Dependence and Reformism* (New York: Praeger, 1984).
7. For a discussion of the structuralist position, see Kenneth P. Jameson, "Latin American Structuralism: A Methodological Perspective," *World Development* 14 (February 1986): 223–232.
8. For example, Walt W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960). For a recent restatement of this orthodox approach, see Bruce Herrick and Charles P. Kindleberger, *Economic Development*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).
9. Frank, *Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution*, p. 5.
10. *Ibid.* (emphasis in the original); see also *Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, pp. 3–6.
11. This point should not, of course, be taken to imply that Frank does not admit the possibility or desirability of socialist development. Quite to the contrary. But socialist development is a relatively recent phenomenon and cannot be part of the explanation of underdevelopment.
12. As we shall see in our discussion of Lall's criticism of Frank below, this initial distinction is open to damaging criticism.
13. It should be noted that not all Dependency Theorists would agree with this last point. For instance, dos Santos defines "dependence" in the following way: "Dependence is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. A relationship of interdependence between two or more economies and the world trading system becomes a dependent relationship when some countries can expand through self-impulsion while others, being in a dependent position, can only expand as a reflection of the dominant countries, which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development." (emphasis added) (T. dos Santos, "The Structure of Dependence," *American Economic Review*, Papers and Proceedings 40

[May 1970]: 231–236.) The trouble with this definition is that if in fact the dependency relation has positive effects on the development of the dependent country, then it is hard to see how the theory can serve the critical function that Frank, at least, wants to give it. Three possible replies to this point are (1) that the positive effects are *immediate* and not long-term, and that the long-term effects of dependent development are and must be negative; (2) that even if there are positive effects on development, as long as the dependent country is dominated from without and does not control its own development, there is a violation of national autonomy, if not sovereignty, and this is to be criticized; and (3) that the theory is not meant to be critical, but only descriptive. The problems with these replies are that the first makes it unclear why the short-term positive effects should ever be mentioned; the second reply, if it is intended to support a critical theory, requires an additional argument to the effect that the loss of autonomy is worse than the gain in economic development, and this would be a controversial claim; and the third reply is not accurate, at least in relation to Frank. This entire problem can be sidetracked by building the normative dimension into the concept of dependence from the beginning. Sanjaya Lall also makes the point that “dependence” as used by the Dependency Theory school has a definite normative dimension, namely, that the future development of the dependent economy is adversely affected by its being dependent. See Sanjaya Lall, “Is ‘Dependence’ a Useful Concept in Analysing Underdevelopment?” *World Development* 3 (November and December 1975): 799–800. For an additional discussion and critique of Frank’s use of the concept of dependence, see Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, pp. 164 and 177–180.

14. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, p. 9. It should be noted that while Frank’s view requires a complete account of the origins and development of capitalism, and he acknowledges as much, his early work only gestured at such an account. In more recent work, however, he has attempted to develop more fully this side of his project. See especially, *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment* and *World Accumulation 1492–1789*. It should also be mentioned that Immanuel Wallerstein shares Frank’s view of capitalism as a world system and more or less agrees with Frank’s understanding of what capitalism is and how it works. Wallerstein’s work has, of course, concentrated on the historical development of the capitalist world system, and in many ways the projects and perspectives of Frank and Wallerstein complement each other. Thus many of the points we make about Frank could easily be adapted to fit Wallerstein’s work. See Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World—Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974) and *The Capitalist World Economy* (Cambridge and Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, 1979).
15. See for instance Ernesto Laclau, “Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America,” *New Left Review*, no. 67 (May–June 1971), p. 24; and Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, p. 160.
16. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, p. 20; also see pp. 14–15.
17. Brewer makes this point in *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, p. 160.
18. Laclau, “Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America,” pp. 24–25.
19. This point is made by Laclau, *ibid.*, p. 22, and Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, p. 160. This criticism is one to which Frank tries to respond in his later work; see *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*, p. xii.

20. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, p. 12.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
23. See *Lumpenbourgeoisie: Lumpendevlopment*, p. 13.
24. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment*, p. 94. Also see *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*, p. 123.
25. *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*.
26. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
27. The article under discussion is Lall, “Is ‘Dependence’ a Useful Concept?”
28. *Ibid.*, p. 800.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 800.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 808–809 (emphasis in the original).
31. Notice that even putting the point this way circumscribes the audience to which the claim is addressed, for only those theorists who are predisposed to be sympathetic to the concept of dependence in the first place will have any initial notions or intuitions concerning the use of the concept; but without such intuitions, it is impossible to agree or disagree with the initial distinction. Without initial notions as to concept boundaries, no economies are obviously dependent or obviously nondependent.
32. Robert Brenner, “The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism,” *New Left Review*, no. 104 (July–August 1977), p. 83.
33. In particular, Brenner cites Sweezy’s contribution to *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*, introduced by Rodney Hilton (London: New Left Review, 1976) and Wallerstein’s *The Modern World System* and a series of subsequent articles listed in *ibid.*, p. 29, footnote 7.
34. Brenner, “The Origins of Capitalist Development,” p. 30 (emphasis in the original).
35. *Ibid.*, p. 61 (emphasis in the original).
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 82–83 (emphasis in the original).
37. *Ibid.*, p. 85 (emphasis in the original).
38. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
39. See *ibid.*, pp. 31–32 and 68 for examples of this criticism.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 58. There might seem to be an initial tension between the claim that the explanation generated by the Frank–Wallerstein model at the same time is deterministic and yet relies on the free choice of rational individuals. If the individuals are really free, surely it is possible that they won’t choose to act as the model determines they do. This tension, we think, can be dissolved by two considerations. First, the explanation is deterministic, not in the strong sense of metaphysical necessity, but rather in the sense of a lawlike natural relation. Second, it is important that the free individuals involved are also rational, where this is a strong condition. Given their assumed motivation, profit maximizing, and their assumed rationality, the individuals really do have no choice. For an individual to fail to act in the way the model stipulates would mean either that one of the initial assumptions was violated, or that some other variable was involved that the model failed to take into account. Thus, if the model is correct and given the nature of human beings as assumed by the model, and the initial conditions, it follows that the behavior predicted by the model obtains.
41. Brenner makes this point in several ways and in several places, directed variously against Smith, Sweezy, Wallerstein, and Frank. See for examples, *ibid.*, pp. 34, 45, 55, 58, 67, and 83.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
44. Brenner also makes this criticism in various ways; *ibid.*, pp. 48–50 and 79–82.
45. Among the other interesting critics see especially Palma, "Dependency."
46. The individuals whose work exemplifies the articulation of MOP approach include Laclau, Rey, Arrighi, and Bradby. The most comprehensive surveys of this approach are Aidan Foster-Carter, "The Modes of Production Controversy," *New Left Review*, no. 107 (1978): 47–77, and John G. Taylor, *From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of the Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment* (London: Macmillan Press, 1979).
47. C. F. S. Cardoso, Banaji, and Alavi are among those who have developed this particular interpretation of MOP analysis. See Foster-Carter, "Modes of Production Controversy," pp. 63–64, and Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, pp. 268–272.
48. The work of Palloix, Cypher, Warren, and Barkin is representative. Unfortunately, the tendency is to submerge this approach within a more comprehensive MOP school of thought; see, e.g., James M. Cypher, "The Internationalization of Capital and the Transformation of Social Formations: A Critique of the Monthly Review School," *Review of Radical Political Economics* 11 (Winter 1979): 33–49. Our brief survey is an attempt to demonstrate the specificity of this internationalization of capital interpretation of Dependency Theory.
49. For example, in the surveys by Foster-Carter, Taylor, and Brewer.
50. Palma is one who has commented on the problem of "operationalizing" the concepts of Frank's formulation of Dependency Theory; see his "Dependency."
51. The most famous are Rey, Meillasoux, and Terray.
52. Laclau, "Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America," pp. 19–37.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
54. Many of the MOP theorists have acknowledged their intellectual debt to the work of Althusser and Balibar. A central text in this tradition is Louis Althusser and Etienne Balibar, *Reading Capital* (London: New Left Books, 1975).
55. Essentialism is defined by Althusser and Balibar as a form of analysis in which the relations among social processes are understood in terms of essence—phenomenon relations. It is more or less synonymous with reductionism and determinism. According to Althusser and Balibar, the two most common forms of essentialism in the Marxist theoretical tradition are economic determinism and theoretical humanism. In both cases, an essence (the economy or human nature) serves to ultimately determine all other aspects of society (politics, culture, etc.) as the phenomenal forms of that essence. See, in particular, Louis Althusser, *For Marx* (New York: Vintage, 1970). This critique of essentialism and the project of formulating a nonessentialist interpretation of Marxist theory have been extended more recently by Stephen Resnick and Richard Wolff, "Marxist Epistemology: The Critique of Economic Determinism" *Social Text*, no. 6 (Fall 1982): 31–72.
56. The debate was initiated by the publication of Maurice Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism* (New York: International Publishers, 1947). The actual debate between Dobb and Paul Sweezy in *Science and Society*, along with other contributions, was published as *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*.
57. Barry Hindess and Paul Hirst, *Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975).
58. Barry Hindess and Paul Hirst, *Modes of Production and Social Formation: An Auto-Critique of "Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production"* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1977).

59. See Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (New York: International, [originally published in Russian: 1917] 1933) and Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul [1913] 1951).
60. Cf. the discussion by Foster-Carter, "Modes of Production Controversy," p. 53.
61. Pierre-Philippe Rey, *Colonialisme, Neo-colonialisme, et Transition au Capitalisme* (Paris: Maspero, 1971), *Les Alliances de Classes* (Paris: Maspero, 1973) and, in English, "The Lineage Mode of Production," *Critique of Anthropology*, no. 3 (Spring 1975): 27–79. Rey's work analyzed by Barbara Bradby, "The Destruction of Natural Economy," in Harold Wolpe, ed. *The Articulation of Modes of Production: Essays from Economy and Society* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), pp. 93–127.
62. The classic example is Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*.
63. A position elaborated by Bradby, "Destruction of Natural Economy."
64. *Ibid.*, p. 95
65. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
66. Harold Wolpe, "Introduction," in Wolpe, ed., *Articulation of Modes of Production*, p. 41.
67. Anibal Quijano Obregon, "The Marginal Pole of the Economy and the Marginalised Labour Force," in Wolpe, ed. *Articulation of Modes of Production*, p. 255.
68. "Modes of Production Controversy," p. 23.
69. Giovanni Arrighi, "Labour Supplies in Historical Perspective: A Study of the Proletarianization of the African Peasantry in Rhodesia," *Journal of Development Studies* 3 (1970): 197–234.
70. Conceptions of historical development based on more or less inevitable successions of MOP are criticized by Umberto Melotti, *Marx y el Tercer Mundo* (Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 1974).
71. Certainly many of Marx's oft-quoted summary statements on historical development can be interpreted as laying out an inevitable succession of stages; one example is the following: "In broad outline, Asiatic, ancient, feudal and modern bourgeois modes of production can be designated as epochs marking progress in the economic development of society" (Karl Marx, "Preface," *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* [New York: International Publishers, 1970], p. 21.) However, Marx himself made clear that his objective was not to present "an historic-philosophic theory of the general path every people is fated to tread" (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy*, Lewis S. Feuer, ed. [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959], p. 440.) Stalin's interpretation, to take one example, is exactly such a "philosophy of history"; see his "Anarchism or Socialism?" and "Dialectical Materialism" in J. V. Stalin, *Works*, vol. 1 (1901–1907) (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1952).
72. Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, and Henri Pirenne, *Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1937).
73. Ciro Flamarion Santana Cardoso, "Severo Martinez Pelaez y el Caracter del Regimen Colonial," in Carlos Sempat Assadourian et al., *Modos de Produccion en America Latina* (Cordoba, Argentina: Ediciones Pasado y Presente, 1974), p. 86 (our translation).
74. Hamza Alavi, "India and the Colonial Mode of Production," in *Socialist Register* (London: Merlin Press, 1975) pp. 160–197, and Jairus Banaji, "For a Theory of Colonial Modes of Production," *Economic and Political Weekly* (Bombay) 7 (December 1972); see, also, the discussion by Brewer, *Marxist Theories of Imperialism*, pp. 270–272.

75. For example, *World Accumulation, 1492-1789* and *Accumulation, Dependence, and Underdevelopment*.
76. David Barkin, "Internationalization of Capital: An Alternative Approach," *Latin American Perspectives* 8 (Summer and Fall 1981): 157.
77. Christian Palloix, "The Internationalization of Capital and the Circuit of Social Capital," in *International Firms and Modern Imperialism*, ed. Hugo Radice (New York: Penguin, 1975), p. 83.
78. See, e.g., Folker Frobel, Jurgen Heinrichs, and Otto Kreye, *The New International Division of Labour: Structural Unemployment in Industrialised Countries and Industrialisation in Developing Countries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).
79. Cypher, "Internationalization of Capital," and Bill Warren, *Imperialism: Pioneer of Capitalism* (London: New Left Books, 1980).
80. Internationalization of Capital," p. 158.
81. Samir Amin, *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*, trans. Brian Pearce (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976), p. 104.
82. *Ibid.* p. 16.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
84. For example, *L'Economie du Maghreb*, 2 vols. (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1966); *Le Developpement du Capitalisme en Cote d'Ivoire* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1967); *L'Afrique de l'Ouest Bloquee* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1971); and *Neo-Colonialism in West Africa*, trans. Francis McDonagh (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973).
85. This point concerning the epistemological status of history in Amin's work, as well as the more general analysis of this section, shares much with the more extensive critical analysis of Amin's theory of development by Joseph Medley, "Economic Growth and Development: A Critique of Samir Amin's Conception of Capital Accumulation and Development," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst (May 1981).
86. Amin, *Unequal Development*, p. 199.
87. Samir Amin, "Crisis, Nationalism, and Socialism," in Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Dynamics of Global Crisis* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982), pp. 168-169.
88. This model of autcentric and, below, of extraverted development is presented by Amin in summary form in "Accumulation and Development: A Theoretical Model," *Review of African Political Economy*, no. 1 (1974): 9-26, and explored at length in *Accumulation on a World Scale*, 2 vols. (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975).
89. Similar concepts of "social articulation" and "social disarticulation" are used by Alain de Janvry (with Elisabeth Sadoulet), "Social Articulation as a Condition for Equitable Growth," *Journal of Development Economics* 13 (1983): 275-303.
90. Amin, *Unequal Development*, p. 292.
91. Arghiri Emmanuel, *Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*, trans. Brian Pearce (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972).
92. Amin, "Crisis, Nationalism, and Socialism," p. 151.
93. See, e.g., the comments by Charles Bettelheim published as Appendices I and III to Emmanuel, *Unequal Exchange*, and the recent survey article by David Evans, "A Critical Assessment of Some Neo-Marxian Trade Theories," *Journal of Development Studies* 20 (January 1984): 202-226.
94. This interpretation of Marx's theory of value is presented at length by Bruce Roberts, "Value Categories and Marxian Method: A Different View of Value-

- Price Transformation," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst (September 1981).
95. Richard D. Wolff, "Marxian Crisis Theory: Structure and Implications," *Review of Radical Political Economics* 10 (Spring 1978): 50.
96. Amin, *Unequal Development*, p. 196.
97. See, for a representative sample, the following: Jonathan Schiffer, "The Changing Postwar Pattern of Development or the Accumulated Wisdom of Samir Amin," *World Development* 9 (1981): 515-537; Sheila Smith, "The Ideas of Samir Amin: Theory of Tautology," *Journal of Development Studies* 17 (October 1980) and "Class Analysis versus World Systems: Critique of Samir Amin's Typology of Underdevelopment," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 12 (1982): 7-18; and John Weeks and Eliabeth Dore, "International Exchange and the Causes of Backwardness," *Latin American Perspectives* 6 (Spring 1979): 71-77.
98. Samir Amin, "Expansion or Crisis of Capitalism?" *Third World Quarterly* 5 (April 1983): 361-385.
99. *Ibid.*, p. 365.
100. *Ibid.*, p. 377.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 376.
102. *Ibid.*, p. 371.