

# Dependency and Development- A Comparative Analysis

Santhosh .N

*Lecturer in Commerce, Sir M V Post Graduate Centre, Mandya*

## Abstract

*What explains the divergent development trajectories of various international locations and societies? Why has the growing global failed to near the distance with the industrialized nations? This research paper evaluations the literature through pupils in the Marxist tradition that addresses these and other questions of development, beginning with the writings of Karl Marx, persevering with through the work of Vladimir Lenin, and finishing with the greater recent work of the dependency theorists. This literature is full-size. And like the writings of Marx himself, there are frequently competing or maybe opposing theoretical arguments from pupils considered a part of this culture. Taken together, this literature bureaucracy a long lasting theoretical counterpoint to the liberal economic principle that has informed generations of policymakers from both developed and developing countries.*

Marxist, neo-Marxist, and dependency factors of development range from traditional liberal economics in the importance of noneconomic factors for explaining improvement. Liberal economists emphasize that international locations can best promote improvement by using restricting social and political worries from coverage making and with the aid of integrating their country wide economies into the worldwide marketplace. In reaction, the literature featured on this studies paper suggests that development may be explained best thru an understanding of the social and political underpinnings of policy making and that self-interested countries should view monetary interdependence as inherently asymmetrical. Neo-Marxist and dependency theorists argue that capitalism distributes the advantages or profits from financial production in an choppy style, so precise agencies or training of people gain more than others in a domestic economy. This common sense is extended to the global system, in which the shape of world markets ensures that wealth becomes concentrated in a small organization of countries at the expense of a larger institution of developing countries.

This studies paper now turns to Marx and the theoretical beginnings of this method, accompanied through a brief evaluate of Lenin's theoretical revision and extension that served as a benchmark for the neo-Marxists of the early 20th century. The ultimate half of the paper attempts to impose some order at the sprawling literature known as dependency theory. These pupils borrowed, regularly selectively, from orthodox

Marxism to provide an explanation for the improvement fortunes of the growing world and the connection of these nations to their industrialized opposite numbers within the North.

## II. Marx and Lenin

Karl Marx (1818) and the scholars who observed him signify capitalist economies as inherently conflictual and exploitative. In his critique, Marx described how the dynamics of capitalism provide a effective force for generating and gathering wealth. Adam Smith (1776/1994), David Ricardo (1817), and the liberal economists that accompanied them explained that capitalist markets are self-regulating. However over the long time, Marxists argue, capitalist markets do not have a natural, self-regulating equilibrium. Alternatively, capitalist structures are challenge to cycles on the way to impose superb fees on societies and will boom in severity as capitalism matures. Employees, as opposed to producers, will endure the financial and social charges of these market fluctuations. Marx argued that workers in the end would reject capitalism in want of socialism by using way of a popular revolution. Of direction, a worldwide socialist revolution has now not materialized, but pupils operating within the Marxist way of life have preserved the principal assumptions of Marx to give an explanation for political and financial development in the least developed international locations (LDCs), and a few preserve to name for a Marxist revolution.

Marx's writing became huge-ranging, and his scholarship has spurred huge, and regularly divergent, scholarship. His clarification of capitalist improvement centered at the productive process wherein economic interest produced surplus value, or income, that amassed to the bourgeoisie, or proprietors of capital, in preference to employees. Marx defined that the advent of surplus cost is vital for capital accumulation, that's an important determinant of mid- to long-time period monetary development. Because people, by way of definition, are excluded from ownership, they also are excluded from reaping the actual blessings in their labor.

Marx hired a particular analytical technique, which he described as a materialist concept of records, or historical materialism. From this perspective, society's development over time through distinct modes of manufacturing decided through the tools, herbal resources, era, and other productive sources to be had to them. Marxist students disagree on the quantity of particular modes, however the modes begin with tribal societies, keep through feudalism, and quit at the best stage of improvement, the capitalist mode of manufacturing. At every mode, or level, societies organize themselves differently and develop unique and economically contingent approaches of dividing the surplus in their productive pastime. This procedure yields a specific social and political superstructure that rests on the mode of manufacturing and is precise to a society's stage of economic development. Feudal societies, as an instance, had social and political institutions dramatically distinctive from the ones of the societies in the newly industrializing countries of Western Europe inside the overdue nineteenth century. Marx's analysis of early commercial Europe centered on the transition from a feudal political financial system to a capitalist gadget. The most vital implication of Marx's insight is that

political relations are contingent on and will reply to changes in effective hobby. It's far on this nexus—the recursive relationship among financial and political development—that neo-Marxist and dependency theorists attention their scholarship.

The primary is the regulation of disproportionality. Liberal economics assumes that markets generally tend clearly closer to equilibrium, with the delivery of products produced both growing and falling to fulfill demand. The fees of goods can even vary in reaction to marketplace indicators, ensuring that capitalist financial structures will not often suffer from severe disequilibrium. in preference to equilibrium, Marx proposed the law of disproportionality, which stated that the efficient performance of capitalism will instead trigger more and more excessive monetary fluctuations, leaving markets with an oversupply of goods or workers (clients) who lack the assets to buy them. Whilst the social and political fallout from disproportionality combines with the alternative bad consequences of capitalism, social upheaval and political revolution will end result. The second law emphasized by using Marx is the regulation of capital accumulation. Capitalist markets provide possibilities for manufacturers to correctly attain income and to build up the surplus cost, or wealth, of financial activity. Over time, the internal dynamics of capitalism generally tend to pay attention wealth inside the palms of a few, which in turn can have an effect on the effective and consumptive capacity of domestic monetary systems. This attention of wealth turns into problematic if the capital isn't invested in methods that generate extra monetary activity. For example, producers may also select no longer to invest their capital but to transfer the profits overseas or use their capital for consumption. Thus, capitalist systems can be denied funding that is required for continued financial growth. Marx argued that the attention of capital might in the long run breed social and political unrest among workers that could destabilize international locations or maybe trigger a famous revolution.

The third and very last law of capitalism emphasized by Marx is the long term decrease in earnings found out through manufacturers. The area of competitive markets encourages producers to shield their earnings margins by growing the efficiency of their operations, via lowering exertions costs, by incorporating generation, or by other approach of miserable wages. Workers, confronted with higher costs of unemployment or reduced buying energy, force down the rate of products and similarly depress the profits of manufacturers. Again, Marx predicts that political and social charges of this dynamic unrest will sooner or later trigger famous protest to confront the fees of capitalism.

Marx's early work furnished a complicated critique of capitalism, but he determined that his theoretical framework did no longer suit very well when he grew to become his attention to the nations of Asia, in which the feudal and precapitalist traits that he determined in Europe did not exist. Furthermore, what's known as the Asiatic mode of manufacturing did now not have the class conflicts that Marx determined in Western Europe, which left Asian nations without the dialectical class war that may propel a rustic's development trajectory.

Almost 40 years handed between Marx's work and the primary publishing of Lenin's (1939) essential paintings, Imperialism, which undertook the venture of refining Marxism to give an explanation for the speedy diffusion, growth, and staying power of capitalism. There has been plenty to give an explanation for. Capitalism had multiplied and flourished among 1870 and 1917 and had suffered none of the systemic issues proposed by means of Marx. Imperialism furnished a description of ways capitalist countries averted the political upheaval expected by using Marx thru imperial enlargement of their monetary and political power. In quick, Lenin extended Marx's critique of capitalism from home political economy to the worldwide sphere.

Inside the past due nineteenth and early 20th centuries, the economic powers acquired sizeable colonial holdings in Asia, Africa, and Latin the United States. These colonies helped increase the reach of capitalism through supplying assets of uncooked substances, markets to absorb the overproduction of manufactured goods, and capital investment possibilities for economic firms. The monetary capital that becomes made to be had by using industrialization allowed the economic powers to exploit the workers and extract the herbal resources in their far-flung colonies. In a subject that might be the point of interest of the dependency theorists some years later, Lenin explained that the imperial powers used their financial might to co-opt the political and economic elite's native to the colonies.

Furthermore, the improvement of an imperial gadget allowed industrialized international locations to secure new markets for his or her synthetic goods. As companies became greener, the delivery of products quickly passed the domestic call for his or her goods. Lenin defined how imperialist enlargement allowed the industrialized international locations to export their synthetic goods to the captive markets of their colonies, thereby muting some of the bad factors of capitalism that were emphasized by Marx.

For Lenin, the imperialism that he determined in the early 20th century represented a greater superior form of capitalism but turned into however a machine that within the long time would suffer from systemic instability. Imperial capitalism generated speedy but choppy development, a topic noted through Marx in his domestic analysis of capitalism. once the imperial powers had elevated capitalism to encompass the whole developing international, Lenin predicted that the terrible results of capitalism could cause battle some of the imperial powers. furthermore, the economies of the growing international—propelled through the forces of capitalism— might sooner or later increase to compete with the imperial powers. those monetary conflicts among and between capitalist nations could subsequently bring about political opposition, armed war, and the eventual death of the capitalist machine.

### III. Dependency theory

Dependency theorists returned to the themes of Marx within the mid- to late 20th century, and they provided a group of procedures to the political economic system of developing countries. Mainstream financial idea of the time clustered around modernization idea, whose important proponent, W. W. Rostow (1960),

advised an evidence of economic development that borrowed the Marxian belief of ranges of increase. Those students saw the development of all countries intending along a comparable trajectory and believed that differing degrees of development definitely contemplated the position of countries alongside this set developmental route. This perspective argued that the economic and political factors that have been important for explaining the rapid improvement of the countries within the North—aid endowments, hard work inputs, generation, and funding capital—ought to in addition power the development of LDCs. In truth, the maximum rapid course to economic development turned into fast integration into the worldwide political financial system.

However dependency theorists argued that the traits of LDCs and their position in the international political economic system strongly conditioned their potentialities for growth. In truth, the relative poverty of the developing international could not be explained as a characteristic in their relative isolation from the global political economic system, however as an alternative will be defined by the manner in which they have been integrated into the global capitalist machine. To provide an explanation for the shortcomings of Rostow's method, dependency theorists drew on the complete panoply of Marxist and neo-Marxist thought, whilst including a few theoretical refinements that higher explained the sample of improvement they discovered within the 1960s and 1970s. As an example, early Marxists concentrated typically on the relations of manufacturing, whereas the dependency theorists positioned more emphasis at the shape of unequal alternate.

The dependency literature can be divided into critical processes. The primary group posits the "improvement of underdevelopment" and turned into superior by Paul Baran inside the Fifties and Andre Gunder Frank within the mid-Sixties. Baran, Frank, and others truly ntegrated home political, social, and financial elements into their evaluation, but they devoted little analytical area to explaining home actors and institutions. This organization of students also has the same opinion on the need for a worldwide Marxist revolution to overthrow the capitalist gadget.

A 2nd theoretical cluster eschews the progressive political measurement of the early dependency theorists and Immanuel Wallenstein. The students of this institution reject the necessity of a socialist revolution and instead suggest that LDCs can harness the financial electricity of capitalism to sell development in the periphery (defined underneath). This literature also devotes analytical area to home politics and elaborates a finely grained rationalization of the connection among home political factors and the worldwide political economy. Overall, these pupils attribute greater enterprise to domestic political actors on the periphery and argue that in some instances, the tactics of dependency and development can coexist in LDCs.

#### **IV. Present day international-systems principle**

A very last theoretical refinement and extension of Baran's and Frank's paintings can be observed in current international-structures (MWS) principle, of which Wallerstein (1974) is the most proponents. MWS students constructed at the paintings of early dependentistas (dependency theorists), and in addition they

rejected a number of the core assumptions of Marx. For example, wherein Baran, Frank, and other early dependency theorists paid scant interest to the domestic political economic system, the MWS theorists formally asserted that the analytical consciousness ought to be on the global device, whereas Marxism concentrates on the home magnificence struggles over production and the excess cost that comes from it, and Wallenstein posits an worldwide machine of states divided into center, semi periphery, and periphery.

This magnificence-primarily based device places an economically dominant group of nations at the middle and a far large institution of underdeveloped countries on the periphery, all of which together constitute a useful whole. Of path, Marxist students seeing that Lenin have posited a middle–outer edge capitalist shape, however Wallenstein delivered a third class of states, the semi periphery, to the conventional dualism of Marxist and neo-Marxist theorists. The political systems of the semi-periphery allowed them to marginally withstand the political power of the middle and to seize a number of the monetary surplus that might otherwise be transferred out of their USA.

MWS theorists argue that the equal dynamic capitalist forces that pressure economic improvement in the middle international locations also produce underdevelopment within the international locations of the periphery. In an extension of Frank's "development of underdevelopment," this argument holds that capitalism will not produce development in the international locations of the periphery over the long term. Instead, economic improvement of the core necessitates a concomitant underdevelopment at the outer edge. Instead of being loosely joined, the nations of the core and the periphery are mechanistically linked so that the economic surplus of the established periphery is transferred to the core. Wallenstein makes this argument in its most pure shape by using mentioning that a country can haven't any national development of the larger system inside which it is living. Wallenstein and Frank diverge from classical Marxist thought by refuting Marx's historical modes of production. They counter with the claim that the countries of the outer edge will never enjoy the capitalist development of the center but are fixed in a everlasting country of underdevelopment.

## **VI. Dependency theory without innovative Marxism**

The origins of structuralism truly predate the early dependency theorists, whose roots are in the 1950s, however structuralism got here to the fore in 1964 with the guide of the record titled towards a brand new trade coverage for development. This file and the work of the U.N. financial fee for Latin the US became recognized with structuralism and the work of Raul Prebisch (1950). Structuralisms fluctuate from the early dependency theorists of their rejection of the Marxist and neo-Marxist call for a progressive overthrow of capitalism. In truth, structuralism has little of the Marxist ideological technique observed in an awful lot of the alternative dependency literature.

Though, structuralism stocks many theoretical assumptions with the opposite dependency theorists, starting with an know-how that worldwide capitalism establishes unequal phrases of trade between the center

and periphery. most of the same factors that increased global trade within the 19th century allowed overdue developers consisting of Germany and Japan to mix to perpetuate or even widen the developmental gap among industrialized and developing countries. For instance, capitalism requires ongoing technological innovation to attain better stages of productiveness and to generate ever increasing profits. Structuralisms join other dependency theorists in arguing that technological innovation does not constantly spur economic growth and improvement, in particular for the commodity-producing nations of the periphery.

Because they may be “past due, past due builders,” LDCs remain the primary manufacturers of number one commodities, whereas high-cost-added commercial production is determined inside the center.

In industrialized countries, the aggressive forces of capitalism compel producers to introduce technological improvements to boom the fee of manufactured goods via reducing production charges and growing their performance. Employees turn out to be displaced in this method, and in industrialized nations, investment flows are sufficient to provide other employment opportunities for those workers. Hence, the competitive destruction of capitalism gives for better levels of performance while still imparting higher-wage employment for workers.

The structural characteristics of LDCs, but, imply that the advantages of technological investment are less obvious and potentially expensive for several reasons. First, technological innovation is almost always imported from the center and directed at agricultural manufacturing or very light, low-price-delivered manufacturing. 2nd, most dependency theorists explain that the quantity of capital funding available for growing international locations is lots decrease than inside the industrialized middle. This stems, in element, from the commonly low savings fees in poorer nations. As Baran argued, the earnings that might be used for home funding are both repatriated to the middle or consumed through the local elites, whose intake patterns extra closely mirror the ones of the industrialized middle than the ones of their fellow residents inside the outer edge. To make sure, technological innovation and capital funding in agriculture can boom performance, but there's a restrict to the innovation viable in the manufacturing of primary commodities. Despite the fact that they still have jobs, workers are left with depressed wages, and displaced people face a hard work marketplace with few opportunity employment opportunities.

Past the giant overlap with different dependency theorists, structuralisms offer an critical theoretical contribution concerning the declining terms of alternate faced by using international locations at the periphery. Structuralisms argue that there's a long-time period decline inside the terms of alternate for developing countries, which rely upon primary exports, in terms of the industrialized center, whose production sector generates merchandise with ever increasing fee. Over the years, the income for primary commodities does now not growth on the same charge as do the earnings for higher-fee-brought goods. This inequity among export sales and the price of exports creates imbalances in a rustic's balance of payments.

The proof for a protracted-time period decline inside the terms of trade is blended, with many developing international locations reporting intervals of decline in their phrases of exchange, interspersed with durations of rapid improvement. This pattern points to some other critical competition of structuralists concerning the fluctuations of commodity markets. The instability of commodity markets makes for an awful lot sharper and unpredictable business cycles in growing international locations. this is especially proper for nations that depend on a small basket of primary exports, due to the fact a pointy drop in the income for one commodity can have very extreme financial implications. furthermore, the call for for number one exports is externally determined and contingent at the urge for food for those commodities inside the industrialized North. Due to the fact they're not able to expect or anticipate those market fluctuations, countries are not able to craft long-time period making plans for development. Again, the structure of the global marketplace has a differential impact on the core and the periphery.

Of all the scholarly work reviewed on this research paper, structuralism has had the maximum direct effect on coverage making in LDCs. In response to plummeting commodity charges and unavailability of synthetic items, some of LDCs have attempted import substitution industrialization. International locations on the outer edge erected tariff and non-tariff boundaries to protect toddler industries that targeted on generating items for home intake. Within the quick time period, some nations swiftly advanced manufacturing sectors, however many of those sectors collapsed within the long run. The domestic markets of LDCs, even in larger nations together with Brazil, proved to be too small to support a worthwhile manufacturing area. Additionally, the equal safety that saved multinational companies out of the markets of large LDCs also removed any incentives for home firms to improve satisfactory or performance of manufacturing. Because of this, Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico sooner or later supported bloated, inefficient industries that faced no extensive opposition from worldwide companies. Few international locations pursued import-substitution industrialization as a improvement approach after the Eighties.

## **V. Conclusion**

The critique of capitalism set forth through Marx explains how the effective forces unleashed by international capitalism might transform societies from feudalism to capitalism. He observed how the forces of capitalism unfold from exceptional Britain to Europe and believed that in the end capitalism might revolutionize the productive modes of the entire global. The inner contradictions of capitalism, however, would create a battle among employees and the proprietors of the approach of production. The war among those two instructions, which Marx described as a dialectical warfare, would eventually yield to socialism. Most crucial, however, is the declare that capitalism could subsequently diffuse to each United States of America within the worldwide economic gadget.



Lenin built on the theoretical insights of Marx, viewing the growth of capitalist markets and manufacturing as crucial for transferring international locations from their ancient modes of manufacturing, together with feudalism, for example, to global socialism and in the end Communism. In lots of approaches, Lenin's argument stood contrary many dependency theorists. Lenin believed that capitalism would promote the development of the outer edge instead of retard its chances for lengthy-term economic increase. Conflict would stand up while the imperial countries were challenged by way of their newly developed colonies. Accordingly, Marx and Lenin theorized that global capitalism promoted the improvement of LDCs, even though that development may proceed in an choppy fashion.

Dependency theorists, even though departing from Marxist orthodoxy in some respects, draw on the Marxist lifestyle to provide an explanation for economic and political development. Nearly every précis of dependency theory emphasizes the heterogeneity of this paintings, which makes the grouping of its literature really difficult. This research paper posits two agencies. the first organization, referred to as the early dependency theorists, emphasizes the need for or inevitability of a socialist revolution, and the second group concentrates at the opportunity of structured improvement.

Despite the fact that the dependency literature covers considerable and at times contradictory theoretical area, almost all dependency theorists percentage some not unusual assumptions: The potentialities for development in LDCs are externally determined or strongly conditioned by way of elements outside to the developing countries; the international locations of the middle benefit from unequal exchange with the periphery; and even inside the absence of countrywide development of LDCs, the neighborhood elite regularly blessings from the investments from industrialized countries. Baran suggests that the capitalist development of countries within the industrialized middle formed a practical economic hyperlink with the LDCs of the outer edge. Frank extends this argument with the aid of arguing that worldwide capitalism fueled the development of underdevelopment of the outer edge. This idea, it's far well worth noting, contradicts the predictions of Marx and especially Lenin. Wallerstein affords an intense instance of the way those early dependency theorists paid scant attention to the domestic political economy of improvement in LDCs.

As noted earlier on this studies paper, the later dependency theorists understand a much less deterministic dating between evolved and less developed international locations. Cardoso and Faletto additionally see the development prospects of LDCs as strongly conditioned via international capitalism, and that they attempt to give an explanation for the choppy pattern of development among developing nations. Evans extends this angle in his rationalization of Brazil's industrialization through suggesting a triple alliance of firm corporations, the state, and nearby capital (or bourgeoisie). In preference to offering a deterministic model, Evans shows that improvement policies emerge from bargaining, and inside the case of Brazil, a

direction of based improvement emerged. In comparison to the earlier literature, those students dedicate more space to analyzing the structure and function of home actors in LDCs.

There stays a widespread hole between the level and trajectory of development among LDCs and that of the industrialized center. However the notion of the growing international as a single, extraordinarily homogeneous group of nations is not accurate or analytically beneficial. As a end result, pupils inside the 21st century are much less in all likelihood to hire the analytical approach set forth with the aid of the dependency theorists. It's miles exciting that scholars and in particular journalists are much more likely to invoke some of Marx's views to give an explanation for the extended frequency of global economic crises. To be sure, the conditioning effects of world capitalist markets will continue to be of hobby to pupils inquisitive about explaining the versions in improvement amongst companies or classes of nations.



### **Bibliography:**

1. Amin, S. (1977). *Imperialism and unequal development*. Sussex, UK: Harvester Press.
2. Baran, P. (1967). *The political economy of growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
3. Brewer, A. (1980). *Marxist theories of imperialism: A survey*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
4. Caporaso, J. A. (Ed.). (1978). Dependence and dependency in the global system [Special issue]. *International Organization*, 32(1).
5. Cardoso, F. H., & Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
6. Chilcote, R. H. (1982). *Dependency and Marxism: Toward a resolution of the debate*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
7. Cox, R. W. (1979). Ideologies and the new international economic order: Reflections on some recent literature. *International Organization*, 37, 157-188.
8. Dos Santos, T. (1970). The structure of dependence. *American Economic Review*, 60, 231-236.
9. Emmanuel, A. (1972). *Unequal exchange*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
10. Evans, P. (1979). *Dependent development: The alliance of multinational, state, and local capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
11. Frank, A. G. (1967). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
12. Gilpin, R. (1987). *The political economy of international relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.