

SELF-RELIANCE AND DEPENDENCE: A LATINAMERICAN PERSPECTIVE

by

Malva Espinoza

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1	Introduction 1
2	The Relative Character of the Concept of "Development" 4
2.1	Development in the Known Systems 5
2.2	The Existing Development Models 6
3	Dependence and Self-reliance 8
3.1	The Level of Dependence 9
3.1.1	The National Level 9
3.1.2	The Regional Level 12
3.1.3	The Local Level 15
4	The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Self-reliance 18
4.1	The Participation of the Masses 19
4.1.1	Participation under Socialism 21
4.1.2	Participation under Capitalism 22
4.2	The Level of Development of the Productive Forces 24
5	Dependence is Multidimensional 28
6	Dependence is a Phenomenon of Capitalism 32
7	The "Dependence" of Dominant Countries 35
8	The Usefulness of the Indicators of Dependence 38
9	Final Considerations 39
9.1	Self-reliance and Decentralization 39
9.2	Self-reliance and Central Planning 40
9.3	Self-reliance in the Underdeveloped World 41
9.4	Self-reliance in the Capitalist Developed World 41
	Notes and Bibliographic References 43

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of development is for Latinamerican social scientists one of the fundamental topics of scientific work. It could not be any other way since it is our reality to be in the periphery of the international capitalist system, with its implied structural dependency , underdevelopment, exploitation and poverty for our peoples.

In the 'sixties a progressive scientific effort takes place in Latinamerica. Its aim is to elaborate a theory that can explain the fundamental causes of underdevelopment, and that way serve as a guide to action to face the situation politically. This is how the theory of DEPENDENCE is formulated. It is an attempt to explain the mechanisms of imperialist domination and the internal dynamics of dependent countries in our Continent. (1)

The political results of this conceptualization provide elements for analysis to the masses and the progressive forces in their struggle against exploitation. In the case of Chile, the platform of the Popular Unity Coalition is built on the contributions of Latinamerican social scientists, as they themselves are nourished by the social processes underway; this interplay of theory and practice is visible in situations of social turmoil, such as Chile in the 'sixties and 'seventies.

One of the most important conclusions derived from an understanding of this state of dependence is the need for structural transformations, the breaking down of the capitalist and imperialist domination. It is, in sum, socialism as the only alternative for development to ensure a better society, responsive to human needs. The struggle for socialism is a live process in our countries; a socialist society is a clear goal that inspires millions of people in the Third World as the Cuban Revolution inspires millions of Latinamericans.

In the internal dynamics of social change, there is always an implicit alternative model to the existing reality. This is valid for all levels at which these changes are promoted, from microreforms to the broader level of changing the world. In The International, an anthem translated to hundreds of languages and sung by millions of voices, there is an inspiring vision of the future:

" the day we achieve victory
there will not be slaves or hungry people,
the earth will be a paradise
for all mankind"

A problem common to any model or ideal is the existence of concrete historical, economic and political conditions that help or hinder the achievement of that project. The historical viability of socialism as an alternative to capitalism cannot be denied. The consolidation of the socialist system as an international system is one of the outstanding characteristics of this century. This implies a growing process in the antiimperialist and anticapitalist struggle, and a greater number of "the condemned of this earth", as Franz Fanon calls them, are choosing the road of liberation, and that road they call "socialism".

Social processes, however, are dynamic and dialectical. A social science has to be also dynamic and dialectical to interpret these processes correctly. There could not be a more reactionary attitude than to deny, in principle, new conceptualizations and new terms. In these last few years many researchers, especially in Europe and in International Organizations, have become fond of making predictions for the future. This is particularly strong among researchers dealing

with the problems of development.

In this paper we will attempt to examine some ideas and concepts that arise from the current work of Johan Galtung on Self-reliance as a new alternative for development.(2)

The need to attempt a scientific analysis of Self-reliance is clear. The term has become common in the mass media, in political speeches and other public uses. There is a real danger that it could finally be adopted by the capitalist propaganda machine and fed back to the masses in the form of a product for consumption. There are many examples in the social sciences of new terms, concepts or theories adopted without a serious examination, simply because it becomes "fashionable".

In our concept, Self-reliance contains a number of diverse elements that belong to different spheres of knowledge and reality. There are ideological elements; it is in a sense a utopia; it contains ethical principles; it is to a certain extent a current practice; it can be considered a political and social model. Today, under the term Self-reliance we find practices, processes, and ideologies that have been called by other names before; development, revolution, structural transformations, communism, antiimperialism, etc.

It is important to clear the mythology that has begun to be built around this attractive and mysterious idea, a free translation of the Chinese term " tzu li keng cheng", something akin to "rely on our own strength". Is Self-reliance, then, an ideology? Is it a new practice? Is it a non-capitalist and non-socialist alternative for development? Is it a socialist variant? Is it a higher stage of socialist development?

2. THE RELATIVE CHARACTER OF THE CONCEPT "DEVELOPMENT".

In our contemporary world it is difficult to find a place where development is not being discussed, talked or written about. In the last few years hundreds of thousands of pages have been written; international organisms have been created; and a philosophy and ethics have been formulated around this problem. However, the content of the concept, the processes it reflects, and the theoretical and practical implications derived from it depend on the political and ideological context in which the term is used. Thus, it becomes improper to speak of development without qualifiers.

International Organisms have cultivated this ambiguity precisely for ideological reasons. To transform "development" in a suprasystem category is congruent with the interests of maintaining the system of international domination. This becomes clear in the policies of "aid for development" to Third World countries, given with preference to countries with reactionary governments, or at best without discriminating against those regimes condemned by world public opinion. (3) On the other hand, the category "developed countries" is created without distinguishing between socialist and capitalist countries. Development without qualifiers becomes synonym with terms such as material wellbeing, industrialization, wealth, etc. A term as rich as this can acquire different connotations in different contexts. However, the tendency is precisely to strip it of a context and create a mythification around it.

The dominant elites of dependent countries take up the banners of capitalist development, trying to show that is just a matter of "delay" and that they soon will catch up with the developed capitalist countries.

However, reality shows that this structural dependence has condemned these countries to a dependent capitalist development, where not even the fruits of economic growth will become visible as long as there is exploitation at the international level.

In the developed capitalist countries, on the other hand, it is evident that economic growth by itself has been unable to solve the problems inherent to exploitative societies. Moreover, this uncontrolled growth produces a sort of "maldevelopment" by excess, the so-called "overdevelopment", with consequences that are as negative as those associated with underdevelopment. (4)

2.1 Development in the Known Systems.

The world today is divided into two main international systems: the capitalist and the socialist systems. Between the two, they incorporate the majority of contemporary countries. The existence of some marginal areas is not an exception but rather a consequence of this process of internationalization, and their incorporation into one system or the other will happen sooner or later. This is the historical context in which development exists, both as a process and as a goal to reach.

Within the capitalist world there is a certain degree of diversity between the countries, areas or regions. Specific conditions introduce variations in each situation which do not modify the essential fact of being part of the capitalist system. Capitalism in Scandinavia, Western Europe, Africa or Japan is not expressed in the same way but it is still capitalism.

By virtue of specific conditions, socialism too as an international system is expressed with a certain degree of diversity, with more or

less marked differences between different socialist countries. Only those who conceive socialism as a static model and not as a dynamic developing system can reduce the socialist character to a single economic formula controlled by single linear patterns. Within socialism there are alternative solutions to the different problems. There is no single socialist answer valid in all places and at all times; rather, there are certain essential elements in the transformation of the relations of production and in the sociopolitical system in general. It is these transformations that determine the socialist character of a society.

In this context, it is possible to affirm that the peculiarities of the Chinese process, the source of inspiration to "self-reliance", does not strip the Chinese society of its socialist character. On the contrary, it reaffirms the dynamic, diverse, dialectical reality of socialism as a real alternative for development for that part of humanity shaken by the class contradictions of an imperialist structure.

2.2 The Existing Development Models.

The existing development models are based on an ideology, imagination, and a correct analysis of reality. These three elements can become a strategy, a practice and an action.

Imagination alone, when accompanied by talent, can be expressed in the form of Science Fiction. These writers work under no other limitation than their imagination to give an image of the future, with perfect human beings or monstrous creatures; future world can be made paradise or hell. These literary endeavors can be more than a pastime; they can serve to denounce the present reality and can serve as inspiration for a future reality. They cannot, however, provide the

elements of analysis and action necessary to promote social change.

The bourgeois ideology analyses reality, provides a vision of the future and possesses a strategy for action. This strategy and practice is the maintenance and development of the capitalist system and the imperialist structure for domination. These models are perfected, the mechanisms for domination are modified, the ideological penetration is modernized and becomes increasingly more efficient. This is especially true in those countries in which exploitation is disguised by economic growth, by material wellbeing.

The Marxist ideology best combines the needed elements to create a model for development. It provides a correct analysis of reality, of the contradictions, of the economic and power structures that have to be changed to change society. It also possesses the imagination needed to adapt to the peculiarities of each situation. Finally, it provides dynamism to the historical events. Its viability is demonstrated by the existence of a solid socialist world, by the revolutionary processes underway in all five Continents, and by recent spectacular victories in Viêt Nam, Laos and Cambodia in Southeast Asia, and Angola in Africa.

It is in this context that we have to ask ourselves: Is self-reliance a new ideology? Is it a different analysis of current reality? Does it imply a different strategy from that of capitalism and socialism? We will attempt to test the concept of Self-reliance with an analysis of Latinamerican reality to explore its interrelations, complementarity or opposition, and we will do it by using some categories belonging to Dependence theory.

3. DEPENDENCE AND SELF-RELIANCE.

According to Theotonio Dos Santos, dependence is not simply an external phenomenon, but rather it is a characteristic that capitalist development takes in a group of countries in their way to become integrated into the world monopolistic capitalist system. He writes:

" First, we have to characterize dependence as a conditioning situation. Dependence is a situation in which certain countries have their economies conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which they are linked by a relation of submission. A conditioning situation determines the limitations and possibilities for action or behavior of the human beings involved. Second, dependence conditions a certain internal structure that in turn defines dependence as a function of the structural possibilities of the different national economies" (5)

Starting from this formulation, then, in a situation of dependence the limits and characteristics of development are conditioned, and independent development as an alternative has to proceed from an internal structural transformation of these societies. It is not enough to break cultural, economic and military links with the hegemonic center, a matter that even the dominant classes of peripheric countries could conceivably propose. What is needed is the questioning of the internal power structure, to assure that the functioning parameters of that structure change enough to permit independent development. There is no other way for real independence than revolution. In consequence, to question the internal power structure leads to the problem of social classes in society. The dominant classes will not challenge their own power; it is the exploited classes that are called to direct and make the revolution. Even though this analysis has been repeated often and

it is not original, we have to concede its absolute applicability to the capitalist world, both developed and dependent.

3.1 Levels of Dependence.

Galtung's formulations of Self-reliance, as the antithesis of dependence, considers three levels: national, regional and local. The national level indirectly involves the structural transformation of internal power. The regional level involves the antiimperialist struggle. The local level, however, is hard to equate in terms of Marxist analysis, unless we consider the exploited classes to be that level. It is necessary to stop to consider the meaning of these levels as categories of analysis.

3.1.1 The National Level.

The origin of dependence is found in the historical development of the Latinamerican continent, starting with the Colonial period. The political independence achieved in the Nineteenth Century could not transform itself into economic independence, inspite of the efforts of some people who then were trying to set up a manufacturing industry oriented to supply the armies of liberation.

The export economy, inherited from the colonial times increases its dependent traits. Mining and agricultural groups soon shift and adapts their interests, obtaining advantages in the new republics to consolidate their power with the protection of European interests. The Nineteenth Century is characterized by the consolidation of capitalism, not only in the export industry, but also in agriculture, where waged labor force is used in combination with other more traditional forms of labor. This has moved some analysts to erroneously give a feudal character to these countries.

Gunther Frank analyzes with details the development of capitalism in Chile and other Latinamerican countries. In one of his books he writes:

" In a nation power has always been in the hands of a bourgeoisie that was and is intimately linked to foreign interests... We have observed that both the "national bourgeoisie" and the "national state" have been and continue to be an integral part of a world capitalist system, in which they are satellites, or an underdeveloped bourgeoisie and state. This is important to understand Chile and other underdeveloped countries. This way, the bourgeoisie and the national satellite state have depended and continue to depend on the world capitalist monopoly, of which they are an instrument of exploitation". (6)

In this perspective it is necessary to understand that "national interests" can only be attributed to the exploited segments of society. The bourgeoisie cannot be nationalist inasmuch^{as} its own survival is dependent on the imperialist domination. In this context the categories of "the national", such as "national interests", "national development", etc., acquire a clear class meaning. This meaning cannot be neglected in any sociopolitical project that hopes to be an alternative for development and transformation, as it cannot be neglected either in the analysis of reality. Self-reliance at a national level can only be conceived in a revolutionary situation in which power has been wrestled from the bourgeoisie.

There could not be a better example of this situation than the policies undertaken by the military junta in Chile. In the name of nationalism they have undertaken the greatest effort since colonial times to obtain an accelerated de-nationalization of culture, education and economy. Where does this antinational avocation comes from? It

responds to class interests. A dependent bourgeoisie will by necessity see reflected in the national level not its own interests, but those of the exploited classes, thus in contradiction with their own interests.

Back in 1892 in Chile, a prominent member of the Chilean bourgeoisie, euphoric with the triumphant counterrevolution against President Balmaceda, (one of Chile's frustrated efforts of national development), declared: "We are the owners of Chile; we are the owners of the land and capital. The rest are a mass that can be influenced and sold; they do not count as either an opinion or prestige" (Newspaper El Pueblo, March 19, 1892.) (7)

The civil war of 1891 took thousands of lives, bankrupted the country, and unemployment, plague and poverty for the people were the price that "the owners of Chile" paid to defend their interests and those of the British imperialists, threatened by the nationalization of natural nitrate announced by Balmaceda.

In 1973 "the owners of Chile" reacted in the same way when the Allende government threatened the bourgeois interests and Northamerican imperialism with the nationalization of the copper mines. The national interests are those of the exploited! This prevents the national bourgeoisie from being "nationalist" unless it renounces its condition as the dominant class (an event yet to be seen in history).

If Self-reliance is an anticapitalist policy, it will find the same problems and obstacles to its realization as the socialist revolution. Even if the national bourgeoisies were attracted to the idea of independent development, its self-reliant avocation would be frustrated by the intrinsic need for imperialist support to maintain its national domination. The old dream of being "a master of his own

house" is not alien to the national bourgeoisies. They seek to increase their capacity for movement in relation to the hegemonic center. They have gone as far as proposing reforms, nationalizations, protection for national industry, control of foreign investments, etc. All these measures play a progressive role in certain social and economic conjunctures, but in themselves they do not put the capitalist system in check. When the social dynamics that these measures provoke endanger the system, the mechanism of defense of the system appear in full force, as it was the case in Brazil in 1964, Chile in 1973, Argentina in 1975 and Peru in 1976.

3.1.2 The Regional Level.

Regional fragmentation is one of the main mechanisms of imperialist domination. In the Latinamerican continent it is necessary to go back to the eighteen-hundreds to find any evidence of regional cooperation, or unity of interests, of continental solidarity. In the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth century, with the consolidation of capitalism and imperialist domination, the continent was shaken by expansionist wars; the Pacific War in 1879 between Chile, Peru and Bolivia is a clear example of imperialist influence in this type of conflict. British capitalist interests used the expansionist war started by the Chilean government against its neighbors. The only winners from that conflict were the British companies that had investments in the northern provinces conquered by Chile. This type of war took place throughout the last century involving different Latinamerican countries.

After World War II, Northamerican imperialism becomes hegemonic in the region. During the last thirty years the Latinamerican countries, far from cooperating regionally, have been in a constant state of

dispute to win the "good will" of the center of domination. They compete to be a market for the Northamerican economy, to get credits and financial aid, to attract investments from the multinational companies, to sell their products, especially raw materials, to get military assistance and training, to train their experts and professionals there, etc.

Looking at development as a goal, the advantages of regional cooperation are so evident, that it would be naive to assume that the local governments have lacked imagination in their economic policies. That would be to underestimate the capacity for foresight of the technical advisors to these bourgeois governments. The time of the small, petty and ignorant dictator, puppet to foreign interests, is well past.

The reasons for the lack of cooperation, integration and commerce between the countries of the region have to be found in the structural condition of dependence rather than in a "lack of preparation" on the part of the local governments. Even now, in the current Latinamerican scene, some analysts lightly would attribute to military dicators a character of ignorance, with stupid policies ^{as the} product of their weaknesses. A more careful analysis of the situation shows that the economic and social policies of dictatorships such as the Chilean junta, respond to a clear and rational strategy to recreate conditions that will maintain imperialist domination in the continent. Still, the measures taken by the counter-revolution are retrograde, anachronistic, and they produce condemnation from the world because of the methods employed and the high social cost to the masses.

On the other hand, the Latinamerican countries are often viewed as

an indifferentiated whole; the same occurs with the African nations and other regions. The Latinamerican countries, however, possess differences in their capitalist developments. It can be said, however, that the whole region is dependent with the honorable exception of Cuba. These differences make exchange and cooperation not only possible but also desirable. This goal, however, cannot be considered as long as the economic conditions are dictated by the development and expansion of the imperialist interests, which have already no borders. The barriers to regional integration within capitalism are more political than economic in nature.

A clear example of these barriers can be seen in the Organization of American States (OAS), a controlling organism for the hegemonic center. There are no economic reasons that prevent regional integration. There are sufficient human, natural and financial resources to create a cycle of exchange that would benefit the dominating classes. A bourgeois attempt of regional integration is the Andean Pact. Its fruits, however, are not evident, because inspite of timid attempts to protect national interests, this type of Pact is soon controlled by the transnational companies in the economic aspects and by the United States government in the political aspects.

The character of dependence does not remain static; modifications in the international division of labor are taking place. Until recently, the main capitalist interests were in the exploitation of raw materials. Now it has shifted to other sectors of the economy, so that an expansion of the regional markets strengthens the imperialist interests. The policies of nationalization do not create uneasiness as they did a decade ago. The current philosophy is that they are "a necessary evil".

The more permanent economic interests are safeguarded by the dependence of the industrial sector, with the installation of subsidiaries of the transnational companies, for which larger markets are a condition for expansion.

In order for Self-reliance to occur at the regional level a necessary condition would be that the national interests of each country be protected, that the exchange be symmetrical, and that solidarity and cooperation become a primary concern. Is this possible under the current conditions? It will suffice to remember the boycott against Cuba, maintained for fifteen years, during which she could not count on the region neither as a supplier nor as a market. This was not because Cuba wanted exchange exclusively with the socialist countries, but because the region attempted to ostracize Cuba following the dictates of imperialist interests.

The implementation of a policy of Self-reliance at the regional level will encounter the same structural barriers that compel the nations to the socialist, antiimperialist struggle. The efforts of Cuba to open channels of exchange with the countries of the region, and the extraordinary levels of cooperation between Chile and Cuba during the progressive Popular Unity government, show that regional cooperation is not only not alien to socialism, but on the contrary, it is a fundamental tool in the struggle for sovereign and autonomous development.

3.1.3 The Local Level.

The national and regional levels are concepts relatively easy to associate, in particular when dealing with units such as countries and their interrelations. It is not the same with the local level, which

acquires different meanings depending on the context in which it is used.

It would seem that within the context of Self-reliance the local level corresponds to "communities" as smaller units within the countries. These "communities" are characterized by relative autonomy in the control of productive factors, requiring only a sort of "coordinating power" at the national level corresponding to the state.

From the point of view of dependence theory, the local level is not given by the community, but rather in congruence with a Marxist perspective, it is given in the concept of class. In the capitalist countries it is difficult, close to impossible, to conceive the existence of "communities" independently from the social classes in contradiction.

The principal contradictions are not between a geographic center and its periphery, but between a sociopolitical and economic center, (the dominant class) and the periphery (the dominated classes). This contradiction of power often produces an urban-rural contradiction which is subordinated and a consequence of the principal class contradiction. Gunther Frank writes:

"...the contradictions between the metropoly and its satellites not only exist between the world capitalist monopoly and the satellite countries, but also between regions in these same countries, and between the fast development of cities and industrial areas and the decadence and backwardness of the agricultural districts". (8) This is a chain of exploitation, of appropriation of surplus, but it would be naive to equate "agricultural districts" with "communities".

In the Latinamerican countries, and in particular in Chile, the

transfer of this *surplus* from rural areas to the cities and then to the imperialist metropoly is made possible by the mediation of the agrarian bourgeoisie, owner of the agricultural land. They invest their *surplus* in industry, commerce and finances, thus depressing this activity in favor of faster and greater returns in a more "dynamic" sector of the economy, linked to the industrial capitalist system in expansion. (9)

Chile illustrates well the mechanisms for transfer of *surplus*. Chile enjoys natural advantages, with irrigated soils, exceptional weather for agriculture, conditions which would permit not only to supply its population, but also to export food. Some estimates indicate that with the current agricultural land, it could be possible to produce enough food for forty million people, more than four times Chile's current population of about ten million people. Until 1930, Chile exported agricultural products. This coincides with the beginning of the industrial expansion. The progressive underdevelopment of the agriculture is such that currently Chile has to import about 50% of the necessary food for internal consumption, inspite of the policies of the military dictatorship that has condemned the poor to starvation.

It is difficult then to speak of "rural communities" unless we consider a "community" the waged peasants, the small land owners, the small intermediaries; in other words, the exploited rural classes. Thus, we reduce the concept of the local back into the concept of class. This is the only meaningful interpretation, and it delineates a strategy for action for the peasant masses: the transformation of the system of agricultural property, to transform the relations of production in the country and thus the urban-rural relations.

With respect to the "local" level in the cities, in the factories, it translates into the community of interests of the workers, the unity of the working class, the unity of the exploited, manual and intellectual workers, the unemployed, those without a place to live, etc. Otherwise, we would have to accept the idea of "community of interests" between capital and labor, so often mentioned by the capitalists, in particular when collective bargaining is taking place!

The local organization of the community is not in contradiction with the traditional organizations of the class, such as the Popular Parties and Unions. On the contrary, there are numerous examples of organizations created to serve the immediate needs of the workers. For example, the Price and Supply Committees created in neighborhoods in Chile during the Popular Unity government; the Participation Committees in the nationalized industries; Health Committees organized in neighborhoods; the Literacy Brigades; the Industrial Belt Commands, etc. (10)

All these organizations can become channels of participation to the extent that they become organisms with decision power, organisms of popular power in direct confrontation with the established class power with the goal of replacing it. The masses in their struggle must utilize these organizations and create many more. The links that join them together are precisely the common class interests beyond the geographic location, the municipality, the neighborhood, the factory or the school.

4. THE NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR SELF-RELIANCE.

The main ethical principle of Self-reliance as an ideology is "to rely on one's own strength". It involves, in addition to that, not to depend on others for survival, to use local resources rationally,

to establish cooperation with peers, not to develop centers of power, to produce an harmonious regional development, to achieve equitable distribution, to satisfy the basic needs of the individual, to have self-respect as individuals, locality, nation; and region and as a part of humanity, to promote individual development, etc. These, however, are goals shared by millions of human beings, both in the East and in the West, and it would be unfair to attribute them only to the new ideology of self-reliance, or only to the Chinese experience or to Oriental philosophy. In this context, it is fundamental to determine which are the necessary and sufficient conditions to reach the goals proposed by this ideology.

4.1 The Participation of the Masses.

Galtung has written:

"...the participation of the masses is the Alpha and Omega of self-reliance" (11) Without participation there is no self-reliance. Thus, it is necessary to determine the size and characteristics of the basic economic unit that permits control of the economic factors. This unit would be the Chinese-style community. A key to any analysis is to determine a) what is meant by "participation of the masses" and b) which are the forms of participation adequate to different sociopolitical realities; that is, the strategies for action possible in a given situation.

There is a conceptual and semantic difference between "to be part of" and "to take part in" a process, whatever the process may be. "To take part in" implies an intention, a conscience and a dynamic role. The working masses, the majority of the population in the capitalist societies,

dependent or not, are part of the social dynamics, but they only participate when they become conscious of their active role, and that happens when a political organization appears to orient the action. This process culminates with the conquest of political power and the instauration of a new order that permits social and economic transformation. This new order permits new forms of participation of the masses in the construction of a new social organization.

This process is not unilinear; it is gradual and multifaceted, but it involves a struggle between opposing forces. This struggle is not only armed confrontation; it acquires hundreds of forms, ranging from minireforms won in the work front, the participation in the bourgeois democratic mechanisms, to the armed insurrection if the conditions are given for it.

The forms of participation in the social, economic and political domains are many and varied. The key to real participation is not given by the size of the socioeconomic and political unit, but rather by the existence of channels of participation. Direct participation will be always restricted to the minimum unit close to the individual, his place of work, his neighborhood, his union, his Party and various committees. These domains are by no means autonomous. Popular control over the economic cycle does not mean that each individual will personally follow every step of the process. Rather, it requires the existence of a structure that permits the democratic expression of the economic actors, that allows decision making at the local and national levels, that allows the planning from the lower to the upper levels, that allows for creativity and innovation to be expressed. In sum, no specific size can assure participation, but the existence of channels of participation

permit the existence of broader and larger economic units with a participative structure.

4.1.1 Participation under Socialism.

The Cuban experience with the "Organisms of Popular Power", although not exactly like the Chinese community, is opening up new channels of participation. This participation has been practiced through many activities and committees, and now it becomes institutionalized as a new step of increasing democratization, possible only under socialism.

The Organisms of Popular Power, with control over a variety of social, cultural and economic aspects, were begun as a pilot program in the Province of Matanzas in 1974, and extended to the rest of the country by 1976. On December 2, 1976, the Popular Power Assambly was inagurated, with representatives elected democratically all over the country.

In a speech in Matanzas, Fidel Castro said:

" This is the essential criterion: all the service and productive units that work for the community must be controlled by the community; all the productive units that work for the municipality must be controlled by the municipality; and so on for those that are regional, provincial, and national, which are controlled by central organization at the national level. The state is only one, but it is organized in various levels and it is administered at those various levels" (12)

This decentralization process is possible to the extent that the masses are organized and do participate in different organisms and domains, something that can only be achieved when there is an adequate level of conscience and mobilization, and at the same time a structure that allows central planning; that is, the socialist state.

Socialist democracy is a growing process of opening up and creation

of channels of participation. This happens to the extent that the masses create and demand them, and to the extent that the material infrastructure is organized to serve the interests of all the people rather than those of private individuals.

4.1.2 Participation under Capitalism.

By definition, the capitalist structure, based on the exploitation of the masses, does not allow them any real participation. The participation mechanisms of the bourgeois democracy are based on the class structure of those societies. The elected governments and organisms administer the state for the benefit of the dominant classes and their economic interests. When the electoral mechanisms are used by the masses, and they threaten to change the nature of that state, the mechanisms of defense of the bourgeois state, its armed forces, aided and guided by their counterparts in the hegemonic center, intervene to put things back in place. The case of Chile under the Popular Unity government illustrates this process, and it serves to underscore the fragility of the role of elections in the maintenance and functioning of the bourgeois state.

The participation of the masses under these systems can only be understood as a struggle against the status quo. This analysis is as valid for the developed capitalist countries as it is for the dependent capitalist countries. The distance that exists between the dominant classes in the hegemonic center and its masses is the same as that between the dominant classes and the masses in dependent countries. Decision making, policy formulation, and use of power are beyond their reach in both cases. The only visible difference is the relatively higher standard of living of the masses in the hegemonic capitalist country.

Contrary to what bourgeois ideologists affirm, capitalist development

does not elevate substantially the situation of workers; alienation, lack of incentives, exploitation disguised as wellbeing, etc., only increase the social problems inherent to exploitative systems. The problems of apathy, lack of communication, social maladjustment, alcoholism, drugs, violence, etc., which are manifestations of an exploitative system, lead ideologists, politicians and social scientists to seek explanations for these fundamental contradictions. These explanations are "psychological" rather than sociological. This gives way to movements and theories centered on the individual and not on the structural conditions that provoke these individual problems. This tendency is stronger in the developed capitalist countries, where the basic problems of survival, such as health, food, shelter, education, etc., appear to have been solved.

The basic problems of the developed and dependent worlds are not the same. This, however, does not mean that the fundamental contradictions are different; they continue to be the class contradictions in a system of exploitation. Here it is important to note that the analysis centered on the satisfaction of material and non-material needs is a valuable approach, provided that this analysis takes into account the broader framework, the structural problems in which these needs are satisfied or not. (13)

Without speculating too deep into "non-material needs" (which should be better labeled "social needs"), we will say that the most inclusive and determinant need is precisely the need to participate, to be the subject and not just the object of action. One of the successes of developed capitalism is precisely the "passivization" of the masses. The ideological domination has produced spectacular fruits there, because

it is harder to get mobilization around the more subtle problems. This passivization can be changed provided that adequate strategies are developed. In Norway, for example, progressive forces remember with nostalgia the process of agitation, discussion and participation that took place *against* the incorporation of Norway into the European Common Market; this was their equivalent to May of 1968 in France.

4.2 The Level of Development of the Productive Forces.

The level of development of the productive forces is the necessary frame of reference for any socio-economic system. This is true even if the problem of power, that is the participation of the masses, has been resolved; a model of development is not imposed by willpower alone.

The dependent world is characterized by unequal development, by the coexistence of various forms of production, the underdevelopment of certain geographic areas with respect to others within the same country, the greater development of certain economic sectors, and the lower level of integration of others. When we say that agriculture in Chile is an underdeveloped activity, we mean this to be the dominant characteristic. There are sectors, such as those dealing with exports, where exploitation is intensive, mechanized and with a good level of productivity. On the other hand, in the industrial sector the industries linked to monopolistic capital, both national and international, have a high degree of development, considerably higher than that of small and medium industries. These smaller units survive thanks to state protection; otherwise they are absorbed by the monopolistic industry. Actually, this state protection is not real, but just a mechanism to transfer *surplus*.

Thus, one of the first measures required by a different model of development is a process of leveling the productive forces. History has

shown that this process of leveling is possible via central planning, channeling of the state investments, the creation of jobs, discriminatory credits in favor of underdeveloped sectors and regions, and other measures to reorganize the economic order. Not even the most radical revolution can forget that the economic systems are ways of organizing the social forces (classes, groups, individuals) around the tasks of economic production. An economic reorganization will always be limited by the material conditions in which the process takes place.

As an example, the two plagues of Chilean agriculture are the "latifundio" (large agricultural property, generally underutilized), and the "minifundio" (small unproductive agricultural property). The transformation of agriculture has to seek the dissolution of this structure. Land reform, applied by progressive forces, cannot use the same strategy for both types. Small properties cannot be expropriated like latifundios should. Alternative strategies are necessary, in the form of cooperatives or other groupings of small owners to eliminate fragmentation, combining these properties with larger units under social ownership, and at the same time creating a different level of consciousness among small land owners.

The small industry similarly has been for years an economic liability for society and a trap of exploitation for their owners. Is it possible to think about expropriating these industries unless there are perspectives for development of the productive forces at the national level? Given the concrete characteristics of uneven development, is it possible to propose self-reliance or local autonomy without a previous process of leveling, without a transfer of financial resources, technology and even labor force?

To this respect we should not forget that one of the characteristics of the dependent world is the migration from the country to the cities. Peasants are forced to seek work elsewhere because of lack of land and jobs in the country. Santiago has one third of the total Chilean population. How can this force be returned to the country, if it is not by creating new jobs, providing technical training, in sum developing the productive forces? Neither compulsive measures nor a high level of conscience are sufficient if the necessary material infrastructure is not there. But, dialectically, this material infrastructure will only be obtained with an active participation of the masses in a system of distribution of resources that is characterized by solidarity, rationality and planning.

In this process, the remnants of the bourgeois ideology and its variants, such as the conservative small farmer and industrialist, the ideas of the so-called middle sectors, the liberalism of technicians and professionals, etc., will give way to the birth of a new ideology, the ideology of the people. Conscience and participation are not automatic processes, but rather they become reality when there are structural conditions. It is not enough to wish for autonomy; it is obtained when the economy is diversified and developed.

In this respect it is important to note the achievements of the Cuban revolution. At the beginning of the revolution Cuba did not have an industry, with the exception of the export-related sugar industry. The same was true with respect to agriculture. After fifteen years of socialist revolution, Cuba's economy is diversified, growing and dynamic. There is no complete leveling yet, but on the other hand no areas or sectors still underdeveloped. On the contrary, production goals are more and

more ambitious and comprehensive. With respect to measures of social distribution in the satisfaction of needs for food, shelter, health and education, no Latinamerican country can be compared to Cuba. Just one index, infant mortality, in 1973 it was 27 per thousand, compared with Brazil's 200 per thousand.

A few comparisons between Cuba in 1958 and the present:

- * while in this period the population has grown by about 32%, the production of goods has surpassed that figure, which means that per capita production has increased significantly
- * the merchant fleet is eight times larger than that of 1958, a 15% average annual growth.
- * the fishing production is 5.4 times that of 1958, with an annual average growth of 12%.
- * Building activity is 4.25 times greater than that of 1958 with an average annual growth of 10%
- * Fertilizer production is 3.5 times that of 1958 with an average annual growth of 9%
- * Electricity production, excluding that for the sugar industry, is currently 2.5 times that of 1958, with an annual rate of growth of 7%.
- * Cement production increased 6% annually.
- * Production of nickel has doubled that of 1958
- * Dam capacity in 1958 was 28 million cubic meters; currently it stands at 4.000 million cubic meters. (14)

Considering the economic blockade and the underdevelopment of the productive forces at the beginning of the revolution, these social and economic advances mean that the great ideological battle has been won. The current Cuban society emerges over new foundations, breaking once

and for all the paralyzing dependence that was not just economic, but multidimensional. The ideological and political dependence play a primary role, and they constitute the fundamental barrier that has to be destroyed.

5. DEPENDENCE IS MULTIDIMENSIONAL.

Dependence manifests itself not only in the economy, but also as ideological and political dependence. Domination and dependence are two poles of the same contradiction. This is the reason why cultural, political and ideological dependence are phenomena that transcend the problem of foreign domination to become an intrinsic element of the internal structure of domination.

In recent years many social scientists have been concerned with the problem of "cultural dependence". There are a number of empirical studies about the mechanisms of domination, in particular the mass media, a most important element of domination in the contemporary world. (15)

There is some confusion with respect to the term "cultural dependence", in which the categories "national" and "foreign" seem to be the main elements. In reality, with the internationalization of capitalism, the "foreign" simply becomes the "conjunction" of the interests of the national bourgeoisie with the hegemonic capitalists.

Theotonio Dos Santos writes:

" To the extent that industrialization takes place based on foreign capital, this takes hold of the most dynamic sectors of the economy and closes its chains, making them more dependent. Dialectically, however, that capital becomes less necessary the more that economy is integrated and thus less dependent on foreign goods. This process is completed with the installation of heavy industry, of machines to make machines. As this

process takes place, the maintenance of this dependence ceases to be a problem of industrial functioning and becomes a political problem. This is because breaking the economic dependence implies breaking with imperialism, and a popular mobilization would be required to implement an antiimperialist policy. The radicalization produced would lead to an anticapitalist policy; to challenge imperialism implies to challenge the capitalist mode of production per se. The maintenance of imperialist dependence is intrinsically linked to the maintenance of national capitalism. This guarantees imperialist domination as long as there is capitalism in the Latinamerican countries." (16)

In a similar perspective, national culture has a class character. This culture, the ideology of domination, is in contradiction with the culture of liberation. It couldn't be any other way after a century of capitalist domination in Latinamerica. The destruction of the native culture, that begun with the conquest, continued during the colonial period and into the present times, makes native popular culture that which sprung from oppression, and it rises as an alternative to the bourgeois and imperialist domination.

With respect to the problem of the Indians, Gunther Frank writes: " The incorporation of the indian to the exploitative structure took place immediately after the arrival of the Spaniards. The immediate consequence of capitalist penetration in the Indian communities was death for many and the transformation of their society and their culture!" (17).

The Indian population of Mexico in 1519 at the time of the conquest was about 11 million people. By 1650 it had decreased to 1.5 million. Quoting Wolf on this same topic, Frank writes that..." the conquest not only destroyed people physically, but it also destroyed the fiber of their

lives and motivations. The society born out of the Spanish conquest sacrificed men for the production of goods that played no other role than to increase the profits and glory of the conquerors. The exploited Indians could not find any universal meaning to their suffering. Thus, Indians were not only the victims of exploitation and biological destruction of their lives, but also suffered a de-culturization,--"loss of culture"--, and in the course of such suffering came to feel foreign to a social order that mishandled the human resources". (18)

The question then is...What is cultural dependence? In essence, this is manifested at two levels; the political dependence of national ~~bourgeoisies~~ from the interests of imperialism, and the culture of domination imposed in each case by these same national ~~bourgeoisies~~ against the values and interests of the people.

In consequence, the only way for cultural independence is precisely the breaking down of this system of domination. The culture of domination has no nation or motherland; it is the superstructure that rises from capitalist expansion, beyond geographic boundaries. It is clear that American capitalism has ceased to be the domination by the United States. It has become the domination of the international monopolistic capital, centered in that country but not exclusively.

"Cultural penetration" in this twentieth century is a more complex phenomenon than just the imposition of "the American way of life". The economic, cultural and political dependence are not external phenomena, although conditioned by the interrelations within an international system of exploitation.

In the same way, "culture of liberation", as opposed to "culture of domination", does not have geographic boundaries.

The international solidarity in the antiimperialist struggle is a necessity. The experiences gained in the struggle, and the cooperation that arises from common interests forces us to place the problem of geographic boundaries in a new perspective. It is in the antiimperialist struggle that the Latinamerican peoples have discovered their possibilities as a continent, and it is socialist Cuba the principal actor in this search for a continental identity. Che Guevara embodies in his work the possibility of action not only beyond one's own country of birth, but also in another continent. These Latinamerican values do not arise from a romantic thought, but rather they are the product of conditions of exploitation that are continent-wide.

Conditions of repression in different countries produce a rotation of intellectuals and workers in exile, who tell their host countries about the conditions in their country of origin and soon realize that the problems are similar. Uruguayan exiles in Argentina, Brazilians in Chile, Puertorican, Nicaraguan and Panamanian in Cuba, and today Chileans in Mexico, Venezuela, Costa Rica, etc. make up an element of diffusion to counteract the disinformation generated by the mass media dominated by imperialism.

The culture of liberation is not in contradiction with national values; on the contrary, these find channels of expression in those places where there is a revolutionary process underway. This is the case of Cuba after the revolution and the short but fruitful period of the Popular Unity government in Chile. The encounter of the people with its folklore, the discovery of national minorities, of the Indian past, the opening up to other peoples, becomes a reality under socialism.

There could not be a more dangerous road for human liberation if

by virtue of the existing imperialist domination, a "xenophobia" arose in the dominated countries. The foreign or alien constitute backward elements only to the extent that there is a relationship of exploitation. Cooperation and exchange between the peoples must be a goal for humanity, and more so for the underdeveloped world, which having taken part in scientific and technological development, deserves to share in its fruits.

6. DEPENDENCE IS A PHENOMENON OF CAPITALISM.

The definition of dependence as a conditioning situation that determines an internal structure of submission, by virtue of the interbourgeois relations, applies only to capitalism. The economic dependence of socialist countries cannot be measured or understood under this same conceptualization.

The existence of uneven levels of development within the socialist countries determines that those countries less developed, in order to develop their own productive forces, require the assistance of those more developed, in particular with respect to science and technology.

This temporary dependence, however, does not result in stagnation, underdevelopment or poverty. On the contrary, it opens new possibilities to give satisfaction to those basic needs of individuals, and creates the infrastructure needed to insure the broadening of the economic system being built. At the same time, the scientific, technological and productive gap becomes smaller, and the society becomes better and better endowed to continue the harmonious development of its own potential.

This, far from being an affirmation based on shared ideology, can be verified. Who would doubt, for example, that Cuba today is better prepared

to endure a hypothetic Soviet boycott than she was to endure the imperialist boycott? Fifteen years of socialism make the Cuban people better prepared , both quantitatively and qualitatively, than any other Latinamerican country. With respect to the labor force, the masses have participated, have been trained for their jobs, and the adult literacy levels are comparable to those of capitalist developed countries. With respect to the development of the economy, agriculture has been diversified, the process of industrialization continues to grow, and it is not oriented to compete in the international market, but rather to satisfy basic internal needs. However, those elements that can be commercialized in the international market, such as sugar and citrus, have not been neglected.

The international division of labor is not incompatible with development. It becomes a mechanism for exploitation when the exchanges are asymmetrical and there is a tendency to increase the asymmetry rather than to reduce it or eliminate it.

In a world of uneven development, there will have to be a transitional stage in which countries that produce raw materials will continue to do so. But these exports, which have been the cause of the underdevelopment because of imperialist exploitation, will become the basis for building socialism. The commercialization of that wealth by the people will promote the development of the rest of the productive forces.

The negative character of the international division of labor should not be elevated to the category of universal truth. This would be a mistake, because international exploitation is produced by the specific conditions established in the relations of production within each system and at the international scale.

Vania Bambirra writes:

" The establishment of socialism in the Latinamerican countries requires intensive national efforts to overcome the main lags in some productive sectors. This is possible through a policy of planned economy to promote intensive use of natural resources. For this process to be successful in a short period, it would require a substantial financial, scientific and technological contribution from the socialist countries. Without this support, industrialization would suffer from a lack of continuity that would prolong the crisis for a long period. Because socialism is an international system, these resources would be available. In this case the industrialization would continue to be dependent on foreign materials, but that would not be a dependent accumulation, but rather a socialist reproduction based on the exchanges between free nations. Obviously the need for more or less help from the socialist countries would be related to the levels of diversification already achieved by the respective productive structures." (19)

The general principle of relying on one's own strength is not necessarily contradictory with the relations of exchange, division of labor, or commerce. Only if autarchy is conceived as desirable and possible (a doubtful matter for great many countries that lack the appropriate natural conditions) can this principle be interpreted as a master key for independence. This argument can take hold easily in underdeveloped countries, the only ones which could consider autarchy with some possibilities of succes. This would mean for the Third World to rewrite the history of humanity, in terms of the advances of knowledge. The cost of such an experiment would be paid in misery and calamities, commodities that this part of the world already knows by virtue of imperialist exploitation.

Dependence is not just the product of international relations, but fundamentally a product of the world imperialist system. Only a superficial analysis of reality or a bourgeois perspective can permit analogies to be drawn between economic dependence under socialism and dependence under capitalism.

7. THE "DEPENDENCE" OF THE DOMINANT COUNTRIES.

Among the multiple consequences of World War II, perhaps the most important one is the enormous expansion of the productive forces in the Northamerican economy, a fact that permitted this country to become the hegemonic center of the world capitalism.

Starting in 1945 the United States dominates world commerce, finances, and it takes the political control based on its armies stationed in a Europe devastated by the war. The opening of the world markets, with no competition to the U.S. economy, marks a new stage in international relations. This is a culmination in the process of monopolistic concentration of world capitalism, and it sets the material bases for an international division of labor that lasts through our days. This way the world economy becomes more and more interdependent, and the hegemonic center and its dominated areas have only one course of action: the development of Northamerican imperialism. This way a process of commercial, financial, political, military and cultural integration becomes consolidated through the installation of multinational companies, regional commercial treaties, international financial systems, and institutions of political and military coordination.

The development of the mass media permits the expansion and internationalization of the capitalist culture, imposing forms of behavior, science and technologies in the service of these interests.

The post-war European economic reconstruction is based on the appropriation of the excedents of the dependent countries, either directly in the exploitation of the colonies, or through the United States selecting two areas for preferred exploitation: Latinamerica and Southeast Asia. (20)

This integration has different consequences for those participating in it; for some, underdevelopment and exploitation, and for others, strength and wealth. There is, however, one consequence that is common to both, and that is interdependence. It is the need of slaves for the master, or exploited: ones for the exploiter, of raw materials for the manufacturer, of labor force for the industrialist, of markets for the exporter and of subsidiaries for the multinational companies. It would be naive, however, to pretend that the dependence of the dominant can be considered similar to the dependence of the dominated.

Europe and the United States are alarmed by the so-called "oil crisis" provoked in 1973 by the oil exporting countries. To assume that this puts the functioning of imperialism in check is another matter. As long as the raw material producing countries are part of the imperialist system, these measures will have only limited effects. The tremendous military power, the financial resources, the strategic reserves, the mechanisms to manipulate international markets are and will continue to be permanent defenses of the capitalist system. These defenses give it mobility to confront these periods of crisis, which will not automatically destroy the system, although they contribute to weaken it. There will continue to be necessary one, two, a hundred Viet Nams, as Che Guevara declared once.

Because expansion is a need of the capitalist economic growth, it is doubtful that there is an ideology capable of convincing the capitalists

of the advantages of "not depending on anybody economically, politically or culturally". The advantages of such dependence are in view both to the dominant bourgeoisie and disguised ideologically for the masses in the dominating countries.

To break the ideological dependence on the dominating countries, there is no other way than to create an internationalist conscience. This search has to find new ideological contents in the anticapitalist struggle, but starting from the domestic front. The discussion and knowledge of the problems of the Third World implies to achieve a clear conscience of the political and economic conditions, not only at an abstract international level, but also and fundamentally at the local level. This is the only way to create an internationalist conscience. Otherwise, the problems of the Third World become "somebody else's", and the necessary militant solidarity becomes a vague guilt feeling. This conduces only to fallacious policies of "aid to development" through government channels, charity through churches, Red Cross, etc. Meanwhile, the mechanisms of domination, such as the multinational companies, asymmetrical division of labor, unfair prices, and high levels of consumption, both individual and industrial, remain untouched.

Just as in the case of the dependence of the dominated, the dependence of the dominating is given as a function of the structural conditions that permit that domination, and it is toward changing those structural conditions that the action must be directed. All ideological contents such as "changing life styles", "search for the satisfaction of non-material needs", the "green revolution", "ecology", etc. that emerge in Europe and the United States in recent years, can serve a function of mobilization, but they are doomed to clash with the existing structural conditions. To be successful, they must become anticapitalist.

8. THE USEFULNESS OF THE INDICATORS OF DEPENDENCE.

Given that dependence is a multidimensional phenomenon (economic, ideological-political and cultural), and given that it occurs at the local, national and regional levels, and given that in each case it acquires specific characteristics, then it becomes extremely difficult to elaborate multidimensional indicators of dependence. We have to rely on indicators that are unilineal, and under these conditions their usefulness becomes minimal. If we add to this the fact that these dimensions are relatively autonomous, that they can vary rapidly due to various factors, this adds to the difficulty to elaborate indicators for this phenomenon.

Take the example of one measure, that of food import-exports. If a country imports 100% of its foods it means that it is completely dependent in this aspect. This could mean that such country is a desert or that its agriculture is completely underdeveloped. If a country imports only 50%, is it less dependent? Perhaps that country produces half of its food, but with imported equipment, which indicates dependence. Perhaps a country that imports only 25% corresponds to a regime that is starving its population; is it less dependent? If a country neither imports nor produces energy, this indicates the absence of industry. Is it then independent? These measures exemplify the complex interrelations that exist in a situation of interdependence.

In each country and region dependence acquires different characteristics. Some will have a dependent agriculture, others dependent industry, others dependent classes, others a dependent educational system, culture, and others all of these elements together or in combinations. Some of these elements can be modified, and others may evolve into even more complex forms, and some will be transformed in the course of dependent

development.

The only things that remain constant and generalizable are the relations of exploitation and the struggle against that exploitation. If it is possible to elaborate indicators of dependence, then the development and level of the class struggle is precisely the best candidate. This is an indicator that transcends the peculiar characteristics of dependence in one sector, one economic area, one social aspect, etc.

The social scientists that have been elaborating the theory of dependence continue their explanatory efforts; they have elaborated typologies of dependence, and they constantly analyze the characteristics of this international phenomenon. They have not, however, attempted to develop indicators of dependence precisely because of its multidimensionality. Dependence is manifested in the total inter- and intracountries structure. Besides, underdevelopment, the fundamental manifestation of this dependence, is so evident that to the Third World countries this quantification becomes useless. It is enough to know that this situation can be defeated. There is a way and it is wide open!

9. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS.

9.1 Self-reliance and Decentralization.

Self-reliance as a sociopolitical project can only be possible in the socialist countries, the only system that promotes and permits the participation of the masses in the various modalities depending on the characteristics of each country.

There is a danger to elevate certain principles to the category of a dogma. It is important to note that the principle of decentralization,

implicit in self-reliance theory, cannot confuse the rational, positive and necessary centralization of certain systems, with the decentralization that is paralyzing, disintegrating and atomizing. It is necessary to understand that not all "centralization" is "bad" and all "decentralization" is "good". It depends on the context. For example, central planning, as practiced in the socialist countries, has advantages as a rationalization of the existing resources.

On the other hand, as a positive contribution, self-reliance proposes a view of a decentralized world by making clear the inherent problems of excessive and irrational centralization, that often bureaucratizes the processes and prevents the masses from real participation. The creativity, responsibility and decision-making can take place at the local level, with local resources and with greater moral and material advantages. This danger is by no means foreign to the social, political and economic organization of some socialist countries. These problems have to be discussed, criticized and revised constantly to prevent and correct mistaken practices.

9.2 Self-reliance and Central Planning.

Self-reliance, even in a socialist context, requires a given development of the productive forces as a necessary precondition for success. Assuming a territorial unit, divided into regions of unequal development with respect to natural resources, labor force, technology, etc., wouldn't it be unfair to propose a decentralization and total autonomy for those regions? Shouldn't a priority be the transfer of resources from the better-off regions to the less prepared ones? This is where central planning has to take priority over autonomy.

9.3 Self-reliance in the Underdeveloped World.

In the capitalist underdeveloped world, self-reliance is a utopia, because there is no possibility of its implementation at a local, national or regional level. From the perspective of the theory of dependence, this paper has argued this position. We should add that self-reliance can have a negative role as an ideological diversionary tactic to demobilize the masses. Worse, it can be adopted by the dominant elites as an anticapitalist façade at the level of ideology but not as a practice. That is why it is important to discuss it critically and to delineate its positive and negative contributions.

9.4 Self-reliance in the Capitalist Developed World.

In the capitalist developed world, self-reliance can serve as a mobilizing factor for two main reasons.

The first reason is that antiimperialism and anticapitalism are diffuse notions for the masses, although they suffer their consequences. On the other hand, anticommunism, antisocialism, antisovietism are very clear notions, set in the conscience of the people by the cultural and political domination and other problems of the concrete historical development. These include the geographic, economic and political confrontation between the capitalist and socialist systems. No one can forget the division between the two Germanies, the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the political exiles and the ghost of a new armed confrontation. On the other hand, they do not see that imperialism and reactionary governments in the so-called Western world are worse realities than those envisioned by the establishment of socialism in the rest of Europe.

The second reason is that, in terms of possibilities for implementation, the chances of self-reliance in the long run are better there than in the underdeveloped world. Imagine that imperialism and big capital were absent from Europe, that the means of production belonged to the people, that there was a democratic process of participation, in sum, imagine socialism. The scientific and technological level, the existing industrialization, the natural resources, etc., would place Europe in a privileged position to attempt a rapid decentralization of its socioeconomic system. If at the same time there is an internationalist conscience, the fruits of this financial, scientific and technological development could be shared in solidarity with the underdeveloped world.

This, however, is a goal rather than a reality. The multinational companies are still here, together with the fishing fleets, the financial institutions, the monopoly of maritime transportation, the state capitalist enterprises, the agricultural properties. There are the OTAN, CIA, ECM, IMF, IDB, and the rest of the alphabet of international agencies. And there are the masses, marginal in participation, decision-making and even in conscience!

If self-reliance can increase the consciousness and mobilize these masses, then it is a positive contribution. But sooner or later these masses will have to confront what constitutes the heart of the matter, and that is the capitalist and imperialist domination in their own homes!

NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

1. Although not always there is complete consensus (fortunately), there are many social scientists who have contributed to the theory of Dependence. Among the most important are Paul Baran, André Gunther Frank, Theotonio Dos Santos, Vania Bambirra, Rui Mauro Marini, Orlando Caputo, Roberto Pizarro, Fernando Cardoso, Enzo Faletto. There are many more, representing a generation of students from different Latinamerican universities.
2. The main ideas discussed in this paper are presented in the following publications of Johan Galtung: "Self-reliance: Concept, Practice and Rationale" , Paper N.35, and "The Politics of Self-reliance", Paper N.44, Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo, Norway
3. The so-called "aid to development" is related to the political orientation of the countries involved. For example, the Norwegian government has approved a loan of 80 million crowns to Indonesia; apparently the blood bath in Djakarta has already been forgotten. On the other hand, the recent change of government in Sweden has resulted in the suspension of aid to Cuba. The boycott against the Chilean military junta has not resulted in the suspension of credits at the level that the international condemnation of that regime demands.
4. See Galtung, J. "The Politics of Self-reliance", Paper N.44, Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo
5. From El Capitalismo Dependiente Latinoamericano , Vania Bambirra, Editorial Siglo XXI, Mexico 1974, p. 8

6. From Capitalismo y Subdesarrollo en America Latina , Andre Gunther Frank, Instituto del Libro, La Habana 1970, p.155
7. Frank, op.cit. p. 132
8. Frank, Op. cit. p. 35
9. Although the transfer of agricultural surplus is not the same in all Latinamerican countries, they all share a common characteristic: the structure of land ownership is one of the main factors in agricultural underdevelopment.
10. See Tor Sellström Massmobilisering och folkmarkt i Chile 1970-73 UF.Forlaget, Stocholm 1975
11. See Galtung, J. "Self-reliance: Concept, theory and Practice" , Paper N. 35, Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo
12. From Castro, F. Organos de Poder Popular: Documentos Rectores para la Experiencia de Matanzas , Instituto Cubano del Libro, La Habana 1974, p.30
13. This is the case of the theoretical framework that serves as the basis for the papers published by the World Indicators Program, Chair in Conflict and Peace Research, University of Oslo.
14. From a speech by Raul Castro on XV Anniversary of the Revolution, Ediciones Politicas, La Habana, 1974
15. See for example, Tapio Varis, "Television Traffic- a one way street? " Reports and Papers on Mass-communication.Unesco N 70
"The impact of transnational corporations on communication "
Tampere Peace Research Institute.Research raports,N 10 1975
16. From Vania Bambirra, Op. cit. p. 110
17. Frank, Op. cit. p. 169
18. Frank, Op. cit. p. 172
19. Bambirra, Op. cit. p. 114

20. In the period ending in 1951, 3.282.8 million dollars were placed in Latinamerica. Between 1956 and 1970, the figure increases to 5.654.8 million dollars. This is surpassed only the spectacular amount of 8.007.2 million dollars placed in Southeast Asia. Figures taken from Bampirra, Op. cit. p. 88.