

OVEREXPLOITATION OF LABOR, DEPENDENCY AND CAPITALIST UNDERDEVELOPMENT: ELEMENTS FOR AN ALMOST FORGOTTEN DEBATE

Pedro Marques de Santana¹
Paulo Balanco²

INTRODUCTION

In 2013, we celebrate 40 years of the publication of the Dialectic of Dependency, work written by Brazilian Marxist sociologist Ruy Mauro Marini. Text synthesis, sort of the Communist Manifesto of the tropics, this work was the subject of intense debate and controversy over the 1970s within the Latin American critical thought. Analogously to the text produced by Marx and Engels, urged the proletariat, in this case Latin American, to the revolutionary praxis, aiming to suppress capitalism in its expression dependent peripheral. However, unlike the character more sharply political and propagandistic of the Manifesto, Dialectic of Dependency proposed a strict interpretation, however, in their more general features of underdevelopment (dependency) in Latin American economies. This text is, as stated by Osorio (2004) a "watershed" in the Political Economy of Dependency, developing important concepts such as overexploitation of workers and sub-imperialism.

Entering direct polemic with the theses of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC/CEPAL) and the dogmatic lines of the Communist Parties of the region - under the strong influence of Stalinism and the conceptions of the Third International - Ruy Mauro Marini, in company of Theotônio dos Santos, Vânia Bambirra and Andre Gunder Frank, gave the initial steps for the emergence of the school of thought that became known, between the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century, as the Marxist dependency theory (TMD).

TMD put in relief the unique character of underdevelopment, which, being the product of the expansion of the laws of the capitalist mode of production, could not be understood as mere absence of development. Hence his criticism of the developmental conceptions which assumed a linear process of evolution of societies towards more advanced forms of capitalism. Meanwhile, the category of overexploitation of workers is a key contribution to the marxist dependency theory, being one of the most important contributions to social thought in Latin America. This is the main axis in Marini's analysis of dependent capitalism in order to capture the essence and uniqueness of its development.

The theoretical focus of Ruy Mauro Marini, in particular, ended up being criticized in various directions, even within the marxist field. The formulations of the former president and sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso achieved certain prominence among Brazilian intellectual circles regarding the interpretation of the TMD, especially the Marini's approach. Having developed much of his work in exile, mainly in Chile and Mexico, Marini did not have a widespread intellectual recognition in the country he was born. The reception of his works in Brazil is a curious and strange chapter in the intellectual history of our country, since, even after the "democratic opening", silence and concealment of his ideas perpetuated under certain obscurity, even among socialist circles. It must be noted that even remotely within his native country Marini found the same receptivity, recognition and intellectual prestige that reached in other parts of Latin America.

His works were obscured in Brazil because of interpretations often mislead and distorted of its main thesis, especially in light of the controversy with Fernando Henrique Cardoso, culminating in the

¹ Master in economics by the Federal University of Bahia. E-mail: marx.sergipe@gmail.com

² Political economy professor of Federal University of Bahia, PhD by Unicamp. E-mail: balanco@ufba.br

infamous text *Misadventures of the dialectic of dependence* (1978), written with José Serra, whose publication in Brazil, was held without response by Ruy Mauro Marini. The replica was only published here more than two decades later. Certainly, no author of an "ambitious" intellectual work cannot avoid of being totally free of misconceptions, but it is the duty of the critic to assume intellectual honesty, care and accurate interpretation not to fall into false dilemmas or distort the arguments of the object criticized. However, this seems to have been the fate of the work of Marini in Brazil, subject to a review, in many senses, unfounded and apparently mixed with personal disagreements.

However, a careful reading of the *Dialectic of Dependency*, along with other articles Marini, as the cycle of capital accumulation in dependent economies and capital and surplus extraordinary, beyond the text response to criticism of Fernando Henrique Cardoso and José Serra, titled *Reasons of the neo-developmentism* show more precisely the concept of overexploitation of workers. In these last three works, written after the publication of the *Dialectic of Dependency* the theory or the concept of overexploitation of workers became a key category for understanding the pattern of accumulation and capitalist development in the periphery of the world system and takes shape for greater precision, settling away misconceptions that might persist from isolated reading of that text.

The purpose of this article is to conduct a brief overview on the concept of overexploitation of workers, who had in Ruy Mauro Marini its original and more elaborate, while it aims to draw attention to the misinterpretation that this category was submitted to. With this, we seek to enter into a certain movement of renewed interest in the work and political career of one of the most important theorists of Marxian political economy in Latin America. This renewed interest is manifested in the growing body of scholarly work and publications that have uncovered key aspects of the entire work of Marini, making it better known in Brazil. Possibly one of the reasons for awakening this interest stems from the changes undertaken in contemporary capitalism and its peripheral regions, which have become even more heterogeneous in their social and economic structures at the time of deepening some traits of subordinate capitalist development.

Besides this introduction, the paper is structured as follows: in the first section, we discuss some aspects that link the concept of overexploitation of labor to the marxist theory of value. In the second section, we seek to present the determinations of this category as the central character in the theoretical construction of the so called marxist political economy of dependency and, in the third section, we focus on the evaluation of some current misunderstandings of the theory of overexploitation, derived mainly from Fernando Henrique Cardoso's critique.

1 – MARXISTS BASIS OF THE CONCEPT OF OVEREXPLOITATION OF LABOR

Marini (2000) closes his little essay entitled *Em torno da dialética da dependência* stating that the overexploitation of labor is the basis of dependency. Such importance given to this category at in his theoretical and analytical frameworks needs to be explained. The absence of a systematic formulation of this category among the first marxists essays and discussions around the dynamics of capitalism can give rise to certain difficulties. However, based on Marx's theory of value, Ruy Mauro Marini, in the mid-1960s, began to use this concept in one of his main theoretical texts called *Subdesarrollo y revolución* (1967). He introduces thus the category of overexploitation of labor in marxist thought, especially in Latin American Marxism, in a pioneering and unique way, seeking to take from it all the theoretical and practical consequences³.

³ The incursion of Marini in theoretical debate of his time aimed not only academic and intellectual goals, but also political ones. Besides his activity as social scientist with extensive cultural training, he stood out as a political activist and leader of Socialist Leftwing organizations, such as the POLOP in Brazil, and the MIR in Chile. His theoretical work is closely linked within the process of class struggle taking place in Brazil and Latin America. It is important to bear in mind this dimension for

It doesn't exist, clearly, in the "economic" texts of Karl Marx such as *Grundrisse*, *The Capital* or the *Theories of Surplus Value*, a conceptually precise use of this category. However, one could envisage, particularly in *The Capital*, the existence of certain methodological assumptions for a possible further development of the concept of overexploitation of labor. For example, when Marx identifies situations in which the reward of the labor power under its value assumes a relevant meaning for understanding the system dynamics. Although, his concern in analyzing the capitalist mode of production in its entire and purely form forced him to adopt a high degree of abstraction, not allowing him to concentrate over certain phenomena of more concrete nature. Under the assumption of capital in general, Marx adopts the assumption according to which goods are exchanged for their equivalent value. Thus, under normal conditions, all commodities, including labor, would be traded by their respective exchange values⁴.

The process of mediation of categories to more concrete historical situations would be, as the initial plan of his extensive critique of Political Economy, thoroughly reworked, reserved for the later books, which, for reasons more or less known, were not written. In Chapter XIV of the third volume of *The Capital*, for example, when treating the tendencies against the law of the falling rate of profit, Marx admitted that the compression of labor wages below their value was one of the most significant forces. But he remembers the readers that:

It is mentioned here empirically, since, in fact, like many other things that should be mentioned here, has nothing to do with the general analysis of capital, but belongs to exposure on competition that is not treated in this work. Even so, it is one of the most significant causes of contention downward trend in the rate of profit. (Marx, 1984, p.179)

It is seen that even in the third book, which takes into account the plurality of capitals and the differences between exchange values, prices of production and market prices, the problem should be only "mentioned empirically." Osorio (2009) points out that the level of abstraction at which Marx operated the investigation of the capitalist mode of production, in its "pure state", taking as a model its genesis and development in England, would be the main reason why the prussian philosopher would not have extracted all the consequences of the problem, that is, the importance of wage compression below their value for the movement of contention of the decreasing trend of the average profit rate.

According to the author, only with the shift to more concrete levels of analysis, Marx would be able to take into account situations that nevertheless play significant roles in the reproductive system, but would not fulfill the assumptions from which he departed. Then the followers of his work had to deal with the problem and its application in specific analyzes of the contradictory development of capitalism, taken as a whole. The main work of Ruy Mauro Marini, or perhaps the best known, entitled *Dialectics of Dependence*, published in 1973, is the one that demarcates the theoretical relevance of the concept of overexploitation for the study of specific laws of capitalist development in the periphery of the system, particularly in Latin America. This work from the brazilian marxist thinker and political activist represents an important theoretical and methodological framework of the social sciences in Latin America, in particular the current scholars around the so-called marxist dependency theory, because laid the foundation for a more or less coherent thesis and interdisciplinary analysis about the contradictions of capitalist development in Latin America.

The category of overexploitation of labor is understood by this current as representing "a form of exploitation that do not respect the value of labor power" (OSORIO, 2009), increasing the surplus product

a more accurate assessment of his writings, which were immersed in discussions of dependency and underdevelopment as particular manifestations of world capitalist development.

⁴ "The value of labor power is determined by the value of the means of subsistence habitually necessary for the average worker. The mass of these livelihoods, though its form may vary in certain time of a given society, is given, and therefore can be treated as a constant quantity. What changes is the value of this mass. (...) Suppose 1) the goods are sold at face value, 2) the price of the labor power occasionally rise above their value, but never falls below it". (MARX, 1985, p.113)

through mechanisms that may affect directly or indirectly the mental and physical wear of the worker. In this respect it there would be an instructive consideration by Marx in book one, chapter XIV of *The Capital*, in which, when analyzing the possibilities of variation of the greatness of the price of labor power and surplus value, assuming a productive force and intensity labor constant and the working hours variable, reaches the following conclusion:

With the extended workday, the price of labor power may fall below its value, while nominally remains unchanged or even rise. It is the daily value of labor power, as will be remembered, that is calculated on their average duration, i.e., on the normal life of a worker and about a corresponding transformation, adjusted to human nature, of the vital substance in motion. To some extent, the increased wear workforce, inseparable from the extension of working hours may be offset by greater restoration. *Beyond that point, the wear grows in geometric progression while all normal reproduction and performance of the workforce are destroyed. The price of labor power and the degree of its exploitation cease to be commensurable.* (Marx, 1985, p.118, emphasis added)

Note that in this passage it is remarked the possibility that the excessive length of the working day, beyond human normal limits, may compromise the labor power reproduction. At this same quote, we observe that Marx defines the calculation of labor power daily value based on its total value, that means, over the average or normal worker's lifetime. Marx announces by the way the effect that the prolonged working day may cause in terms of accelerating in "geometric progression" the labor power wearing, beyond its ability to restore. He argues there is a physical (human) limit for the extension of the working day delimited by the point beyond which "all normal reproduction and performance of labor power are destroyed". It is important to keep in mind from the above quotation the possibility of falling the cost of labor below its value through a longer working day, so that its accelerated wear cannot be compensated.

The total labor force value, from the point of view of capital, takes into account the lifetime of the worker, that is, the total days the labor power owner can sell his or her goods on the market in good condition, and the time of retirement, in which the worker does not participate in the production anymore. The total value determines the daily labor value, taking existing moral and historical conditions as parameters. The wage corresponding to the payment of daily labor force that respects their value should allow the individual replacement, under normal conditions, of their productive and non-productive period, according to the average time of their life. That is how the law of value on the labor force operates under "normal" conditions of exploitation of labor power in the capitalist mode of production. Following the leads of marxian analysis, Marini outlines a theory of the overexploitation of labor in which highlights basically three modes of appropriation of surplus labor time by the capitalists, which can occur through a reduction in the price of labor power below its value: 1) the extension of working hours, 2) increasing the intensity of work and 3) the conversion of the necessary consumption of the laborer fund in capital accumulation fund. The combination of one or more of these modalities turns wage (price of labor) insufficient to compensate a labor process that requires a physical and mental beyond the normal conditions, which implies the violation of the labor power law of value and stunted reproduction⁵. In this case, the capital in order to shorten the useful life and total life of the worker appropriates in the present the work for future years.

Thus, it seems plausible to claim that, despite not having sufficiently developed the theme or not having approached and formulated more systematically in these terms, at various times Marx presents examples of situations in which the exploitation of labor by capital exceeds the conditions "normal" and atrophy

⁵ We see in Rosdolsky, discussing the marxian theory of wages, the following statement: "It is clear that the sum of the 'livelihoods necessary' should be sufficient, in any case, to 'keep the individual worker as such, in its normal condition life ', according to the precise terminology of Otto Bauer, we must distinguish between the necessary energies to mere 'life process' of the worker and the energy spent in the 'labor process'. (If only replace the first, if not worth the additional expense of energy that causes the action itself productive working - or if it is done poorly - there will be a stunted reproduction of labor power, and the price of labor power is below its value". (ROSODOLSKY, 2001, p. 237-8)

reproduction of the worker and this corresponds, at last, the consideration of the notion of overexploitation of labor.

2 – THE CONCEPT OF OVEREXPLOITATION OF LABOR AS THE AXIS OF DEPENDENT POLITICAL ECONOMY

The territory by which it came to configure the Latin American continent was integrated to European capital flows as a result of Iberian countries commercial expansion between the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This fact will have a remarkable effect over the region fate in the following centuries. The historical legacy of colonial economy, controlled by metropolis still dominated by feudal institutions, such as absolute monarchies, established in the early stage of the process of capital accumulation, would have lasting effects on the subsequent development movements of the region. The transition to an agro-mineral-exporting economy and then the setting up of a manufacturing base defined the processes of constitution of a region economically dependent and subordinate to the dynamics of the advanced capitalist centers. The Latin American subcontinent was integrated in international economic structure as a producer and exporter of a few agricultural genres and precious metals, based on the abundant land and natural resources as well as on the exploitation of pre-existing social organizations. These forms of labor, in turn, made it possible the extraction and appropriation of the economic surplus by the Spanish and Portuguese metropolis through the monopoly of land ownership and trade in the region.

Despite his traumatic birth, gestated by the incursion of its territory in the world market, Latin America ended up contributing to the Western Europe economic development through increased trade and the expansion of the money supply, process that Marx defined as primitive accumulation of capital. The accumulation of wealth riches in the Old Continent, channeled, by a certain moment, especially to England, who lived a more advanced stage of transition to the capitalist mode of production, helped create the material basis for fundamental qualitative changes in the development process, namely: i) the creation of a class of waged employees and ii) the progressive real labor subsumption to capital, through mechanized industrial production.

How this happened? From the Industrial Revolution to Latin America, to specialize in the production of foodstuffs and raw materials, would the supporting role of the transition process of the manufacturing organization of labor for an economy based in large industry and machinery. By becoming a hegemonic nation, England, by a particular international division of labor, put in orbit its domination in a set of nations, some newly independent from colonial rule, whose socio-economic development, however, was directly subordinated to bonds that kept with the world market⁶.

Thus, the Latin American nations contributed to another dynamic process that takes place in the core of advanced capitalism: the transition and shift the axis of capital accumulation in the context of the production of absolute surplus value for the relative surplus value. Ensuring the supply of elements of variable capital (food) and constant capital (raw materials) to core economies, specialization of the primary-exporting economies helps to reduce the costs of replacement capital, it included the costs of reproduction value of labor power. And, moreover, contributed to the viability of increasing specialization of England as an industrial economy, which resulted in cheapening the value of elements of variable capital, thus ensuring the lowering of the value of labor power and the gradual incorporation of the working class location the domestic consumer market.

⁶ "Developing a market economy, market-driven world, Latin America is brought to play within it the relations of production that were at the origin of the formation of this market and determined its character and its expansion. But this process was marked by a profound contradiction. Call to assist capital accumulation based on the productive capacity of labor in developed countries, Latin America had to do it through an accumulation based on the exploitation of the worker. This contradiction is rooted in the essence of Latin American dependence ". (Marini, 2000, p. 132)

The surplus labor or surplus value, which is the basis of the earnings of capital, then passes mainly relies more increase in labor productivity. As is known, the growth of labor productivity is accompanied by a reduction of the work needed to restore the value of the work force, while at the same time, expands the working time given as the free higher productivity is broadcast to sectors that produce consumer goods for employees. Therefore exceeded the predominance of manufacturing phase, the ordinary capital accumulation relies then predominantly in the production of relative surplus value, which is based on raising the productive capacity of labor through the incorporation of scientific and technology to the material means of production and goods.

From the point of view of exporting economies, the supply of goods, whose realization depends on external markets, generates an income stream for domestic propertied classes that materializes, in large part, through the demand for industrial centers, such as equipment and manufactured goods consumption. This exchange is particularly disadvantageous for dependent economies because of significant differences between production systems and the central economies with regard to the development of social relations of production and productive forces. The terms of trade between primary-exporting economies of Latin American and European economies in the process of industrialization, to reflect varying levels of technical and organic composition of capital, shall result in avoidance of surpluses in the form of transfer of surplus value in favor of the latter.

The agenda of the foreign trade of Latin America, the focus in view of the actual demands and pressures from the international division of labor and the interests of the propertied classes internal in the export of a few agricultural commodities and minerals, produced at low levels labor productivity and the organic composition of capital tends to result, via formation of an average rate of profit international on foreign ownership of a substantial part of the surplus value generated by these economies. Thus, a fundamental question arises: how can occur, then this value transfer between subsystems economic national and / or regional, if the laws of market exchange-capitalists determine how the standard equivalent exchange? The answer is no longer in the sphere of circulation, it urges us to get out of "noisy sphere" of the market, so even if the scope of the international movement of goods, and into the production plan, more precisely in the technical composition and organic capital in competition.

Assuming that international trade expresses the exchange of equivalents and that goods and services are transacted by their respective exchange values, grounded in average socially necessary labor time to produce them - which, in turn, expresses the degree of workers skills - at the same time, however, this trade flow hides mechanisms of value transfers between capitals and, by analogy, between nations, due to the process of profit rate equalization and prices of production/market formation. The result of that is the unequal appropriation of surplus value by certain segments of the capital. The process of average profit and prices of production formation, as we know, regulates the distribution of the overall added value according to the distinct value-composition of capital and explains, therefore, the unequal distribution or allocation of surplus between firms, sectors, branches, nations or regions. The so-called unequal exchange, which in for some authors meant the terms of trade deterioration, unfavorable to primary exporting countries, is the manifestation within the circulation process (competition between capitals) of objective different conditions of production.

In the sphere of competition between systems of nations where they operate developed capitalist relations, the higher productivity of labor is expressed in a product whose production prices are lower, they do not necessarily fall into the market price, guaranteeing thus an extraordinary gain. This extraordinary gain disappears as soon as the requirements for a higher labor productivity (technical innovations and / or organizational) is assimilated by competitors. The value transfer that occurs through this mechanism usually happens between companies, sectors, countries and / or regions that produce similar products, industrial or primary, based on capitalist relations of production. Not only the extraordinary gains, but

also to apportion the overall added value of between branches, sectors and companies, due to its organic composition, is the proper mechanism for transfer of surplus value between capitals. A second mechanism may operate within the same movement of goods and corresponds to a "trespass" laws of capitalist exchange. In trade between countries that produce different types of goods, it is possible that some other products to sell at a price higher than its value, favoring those who have a monopoly of production to higher levels of productivity. The nation gives free disadvantaged part of the surplus value of their production that is distributed unequally in favor of the nation with the lowest production cost.

In short, two mechanisms of value transferences can act in the field of international market relations: the differential in labor productivity and the monopoly of production - both resulting in a game of profit and loss of part of the surplus value generated by different productive spheres⁷. The dependent economies on primary-export stage fit the second mechanism, since foundations of capitalist production is still not fully developed and therefore they are more vulnerable to the violation of the laws of exchange by the more advanced capital. The class of owners in these economies seeks to compensate this loss of resources through trade transactions, interest payments, depreciation etc., by making use of the increment of the mass of value produced and exchanged in order to neutralize parts or all of its effects.

Unable to compete based on technological advances in labor productivity, local capitalists subject the employee to more intense work hours, prompting them to produce a larger quantity of goods without proper replacement of additional physical wear. The transfer of value to the outside causes the fall of the rate of surplus value of the dependent nation, while simultaneously results in the increase of the rate of surplus value and profit in the core nations. In response, the compensation mechanism, which operates under the dependent economies, operates at the level of domestic production seeking to increase the mass of exchanged value and, at the same time, to lower the cost of labor power reproduction through wage compression⁸.

In this case, the expansion of production scale requires the use of more extensive and intensive labor force, also including the addition of new workers into the production process at the expense of increasing the productive capacity of labor and/or sophisticated material elements of constant capital. In turn, this enables a reduction of the value-composition of capital used in production, while increasing the rate of surplus value and profit rate of the export sector. Thus the increasing value exchanged by dependent nation is expressed in an increased mass of value held, therefore, a higher amount of its monetary form, which allows to neutralize, at least partially, the loss of surplus.

Cardoso and Serra (1978) criticized Marini for supposedly deriving his overexploitation theory directly from the phenomenon of the unequal exchange at international markets relations. However, Marini himself have had warned that what the unequal exchange in fact promotes is the sharpening of surplus extraction methods within economically backward societies. From his point of view him, the very process of this societies linkages to the world market is the cause that spread forms of surplus value extraction based on the overexploitation of workers, as explained by the following:

⁷ Strictly speaking, the term exchange or unequal exchange is used by Marini (1979b, 2000) to designate the second mechanism, the transgression of the law of value. The author treats this as a synonym of "avoidance" of the standard commodity-capitalist exchange of equivalents. Moreover, he considers that the predominant form of exchange relations between dependent economies and imperialist economies, or between sectors and branches of production remarked by strong technological gaps, so that the transference of value would go beyond that one determined by the equalization of profit rates.

⁸ "(...) The problem posed by unequal exchange in Latin America is not precisely to oppose the transfer of value that it implies, but compensate for the loss of surplus value, and, unable to prevent it at the level of market relations, the reaction of the dependent economy is to compensate at the level of production itself". (Marini, 2000, p. 123).

(...) Is not strictly necessary to have unequal exchange to start functioning mechanisms of surplus value extraction mentioned; the attachment to the world market itself and the consequent conversion of use values productions into exchange values have as immediate result the aggressive impetus for profits that becomes even more strength the more backwardness of the existing mode of production (...). The effect of unequal exchange is - insofar as it poses obstacles to their full satisfaction - to exacerbate this desire for profit and sharpening the methods of extraction of surplus labor. (Marini, 2000, p.125)

Would be more consistent to assume, in accordance with its dialectical conception of dependency that

(...) Although the overexploitation of workers is encouraged by unequal exchange, it is not derived from it, indeed it is caused by the fever of profits that the world market creates and is primarily based on the formation of a relative surplus population. However, once set in motion an economic process on the basis of overexploitation, it sets in motion a mechanism monstrous, which, far from diminishing, is enhanced as long dependent economy appeals to productivity increase through technological development. (Marini, 2000, p.177)

Logically, the capital cycle in the export economy tends to break the nexus between domestic production and circulation, since the consumption of the individual worker, whether a native or an african slave, whether the peasant or urban "semi-employed" don't participate directly into the process of realization of the commodities produced by the most dynamics sectors of the economy. This will occur in the foreign market through the demand of capitalist economies with higher income. On the other hand, in industrialized countries the demand made by the worker participates consumer product realization as an important component in global demand as the economy agro-mineral-export consumption of the worker does not participate directly in the realization of domestic production, a situation that introduces possibility of a mechanism of contraction in consumption of employees in order to increase the profits of the export sector. Thus, the domestic sparsely dynamic dependent economy is fueled through two channels: i) the domestic productive sector from subsistence farming and the marketing of small surpluses of extensive livestock and small craft production and manufacturing, all activities of low productivity and small power chain and boosting domestic and ii) the market for the importation of equipment and manufactured goods consumer facing the ruling classes, complementing the cycle of reproduction of capital in the economy depends. The production structure of this extroverted economy is at the root of the high concentration of income and disparity that the "foreign sector" takes it.

These general features of the primary-exporting economy operating structure will remark deeply the later development of Latin American capitalism through the process of consolidation of an industrial base in the region during the interwar period and mainly during the post-Second World War. The Latin American capitalism, despite its development and progressive suppression of pre-capitalist modes of production, centered its economic organization, as in the preceding period, based on the overexploitation of the broad masses of the working population.

Once reaching the world capitalist system a certain degree of development and Latin America arrival at a stage of industrialization, it shall be done from the bases created by the export economy. The profound contradiction that characterizes capital cycle in this economy and its effects on labor exploitation will determine in a decisive way course that the industrial economy will take in Latin America, which help to explain many of its current trends and issues. (MARINI, 2000, p.135)

Arriving in the phase of late industrialization - when productive forces created in the core economies are incorporated - the cycle of capital in the dependent economy is internalized. However, the structural contradictions inherited to the primary-exporting economy, based on the overexploitation of labor power, will deepen rather than to be overcome. The cycle of internalized capital will tend to reproduce, despite this, the circulation pattern again distended between the high sphere of circulation, which corresponds to the consumption of capitalists and middle classes related to them, and the low one, which corresponds to the consumption of workers. Due to the concentrated structure of wealth and the high labor force reserve,

the workers consumption becomes even limited by low wages, which restricts, in turn, the possibility of extending the internal market. At times, there will be difficulties in the performance of domestic production.

The tendency to wage compression, reducing the share of variable capital in favor of surplus value, finds its limits in a consumption level already extremely low and the stunted reproduction of the working masses, and can not, therefore, a permanent expansion of food demand of solvent wealthier classes. The output for the system is then increased involvement of government consumption and export markets in the realization of such goods and the allocation of overaccumulated capital. However, in the essay entitled *El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente*, Marini (1979a) expressed his concern to investigate, in more detail, the essential aspects of capital circuit in a dependent economy when it is already set up an industrial sector of production guided to the domestic market and that assumes the hegemonic role in its dynamics. This situation is quite different from the one existed in the export economy in Latin America, when it still represented a complementary production system to the core economies and last one determined its cycle.

In short, we could say that the cycle of capital in the dependent economy is distinguished by a set of singularities. Among them the role that foreign capital plays in the first moment of circulation process [D], both in the form of money and commodity, as well as the fact that production determines transfers of surplus value (which will be visible in the second phase of circulation [D ']); it fixes the extraordinary surplus value and develops itself on the basis of the overexploitation of workers; both facts lead to the concentration of capital and the premature monopolization, while it divorces the structure of production from consumption needs of the masses. The distortion in income distribution created by that dynamizes, in the second phase of circulation movement, the market sector that is able to support the development of the sumptuary production branches, forcing the aggravation of this distortion to the extent that such branches increase their production and demands the enlargement of the market. The limits with which this second phase of circulation shocks, caused both by the transfer of surplus value abroad as by the strain of the internal income structure, push it to the outside leading it to seek the realization of part of the goods in the world market, with which closes the circuit of dependent cycle of capital as regard to the foreign capital. (MARINI, 1979a, p. 55).

Marini (1979a) argues, therefore, that an increasing share of the surplus value produced and the capital invested in the dependent economy is concentrated in companies operating in a privileged and dominant position. This phenomenon is even worsen if market prices were set according to the level of their own production costs, since, in this case, companies operating in average conditions eventually suffer losses selling their goods at prices below their production costs, which would cause a centralization of capital even more pronounced. Such processes of concentration and centralization of capital underlie the observed precocious monopolization in dependent economies. Empirically, it means the mechanism of concentration of capital through extraordinary profits accumulation that usually prevails in the internal competition between capitals. This situation implies the transfer of part of the surplus value from capitals (small and medium) operating in average or below conditions to the monopolic firms. Thus, the "inferior" capitals will strive to recover their profit rates by increasing the rate of surplus value, appealing to the overexploitation of their workers. Since the scope for increasing the productivity of labor is limited, this is the only way for these capitals to at least try to reduce the drain of surplus value to which they are subject because of unequal competition. Capital with lower power of competition, by resorting to overexploitation of the worker, end up favoring the monopoly capital to the extent that the labor force employed in these companies has its level of remuneration, generally regulated and fixed by the average remuneration of companies operating under average conditions. Thus, the mass of salaries paid by monopoly enterprises is reduced in relative terms, which also helps to reduce production costs.

Besides these extreme elements, namely, the extraordinary profits and wages below the labor power value, that can be find in the analysis of the production phase in the cycle of capital in a dependent economy, there is another feature directly associated with the problem of overexploitation of workers.

This assumes that the working class, and workers in general, is positioned in difficult conditions to claim compensation by increasingly use of its labor power. Although there are some factors, including extra economic ones - such as those derived from state action -, that act to weaken the political organization of the working class to bring forth their claims, in fact, the main restrictive mechanism from the point of view of capital is the creation of the industrial reserve army, which keeps a permanent or temporary mass of surplus labor out of production process and do not put pressure over the labor market.

The introduction of new production techniques, especially by foreign capital, designed to economies with relative scarcity of labor, as well as competitive pressure for greater labor productivity tend to grow this industrial reserve army in the dependent economy. The introduction of technology is accompanied by an accelerated wear of the workforce employed (forms of overexploitation), which allows capital to extract increased production from workers already in function. Therefore, capital shows an even lower capacity to employ more labor, which makes the active army grow at a slower pace relatively to the fast expansion of the reserve army in open or hidden forms of unemployment.

In the article *Acumulação de capital e mais-valia extraordinária*, also published in 1979, Marini begins with Marx's reproduction schemes, presented in the third part of the second book of *The Capital*, to analyze dependent economies and discuss the "weight that takes the production of extraordinary surplus value at those societies" (OSORIO, 2004). In this work, Marini "relaxes" the assumptions adopted by Marx, understanding that the use of the schemes to analyze a concrete reality requires to modify the three assumptions that Marx used in his research, namely the productivity and intensity of labor held constant and the inversion of the surplus in the sector itself. Thus, the author seeks to account for the unique characteristics of the dependent economy. Marini arrives at the conclusion that in a dependent economy only the subsector Iib (producer of consumer sumptuary goods) is, from the point of view of intersectoral competition, able to achieve a sustainable extraordinary gain. Marini observes, finally, that the specificity of Iib, with regard to the production of surplus value and its conversion into extraordinary profit, is accentuated necessarily where the mechanisms of overexploitation of workers govern, prevailing low wages and high profits. As in any other field observed, the dependent economy, based on the overexploitation of labor, suffers acutely the general laws of the capitalist mode of production. Thus, the sub-sectors of the sumptuary consumer goods department tend to growth disproportionately compared to others, subordinating even more, at market level, the department I.

3 - CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT THE CRITICS TO MARINI'S THEORICAL SCHEME

In addition to the long period of exile, we hypothesized that one of the main factors that contributed to the reduced diffusion of works of Marini in Brazil would be the hegemonic interpretation of his thought by the group of intellectuals around the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning (CEBRAP), notably Fernando Henrique Cardoso, José Serra and, later, Guido Mantega.

Commenting on the rich debate that existed on the dependence on other parts of Latin America and the world, Prado (2010, p. 03) concludes that

Here, indeed, there was a non-debate, and in its place there was a unilateral reading in relation to contributions related to Marxism and the revolutionary struggle in Latin America. Such contributions were subject to censorship and political persecution and also suffered one systematic work of intellectual distortion, in which the former president and sociologist Fernando Henrique Cardoso had a central role (...). In Brazil, it was building a sort of "single thought" on the subject of dependency focused largely on the perspective advocated by Cardoso, so that it has signed a relative ignorance - and even distortion - of contributions pertaining to the Marxist tradition, within which were inscribed the works of Andre Gunder Frank, Theotônio dos Santos, Vania Bambirra and especially Ruy Mauro Marini.

The Cardoso's "critical" depart of the thesis allegedly supported by the authors of TMD about the impossibility of capitalist development in the periphery. According to Cardoso, the controversial formula of "development of underdevelopment", expressed by Andre Gunder Frank, would have the effect of denying the expansion of capitalism in economically backward regions, calling them "one kind of reminiscent of Narodnik ideology (the Russian populists)" (Cardoso & MAGNANI, 1974). It is known that the Russian populists did not believe in the possibility of the development of capitalism in Russia, due to the failure of the domestic market and the blockade of foreign markets dominated by Western powers. (MIGLIOLI, 1993; LUXEMBURGO, 1988; ROSDOSLKY, 2001). Thus, by derivation, the narrowness of the domestic market because of the concentrated structure of landed property, as well as capital-intensive industrialization that saves workforce and the low rate of accumulation due to reduced domestic savings, sometimes attributed to the consumption behavior of bourgeoisie, contributed to become unviable the expansion of capitalism in the periphery. Thus, Cardoso appears to treat indiscriminately the CEPAL thesis and those advocated by TMD, assigning them an ideological justification.

Therefore, Cardoso interprets the authors who directs his critics as ideologues of the system itself which they propose to overcome or reform because they could not see the contradictions through the process of capitalist development. He sees dependent economy as an "accidental fact" in the development of world capitalism. This view looks at the simultaneous process of development and dependence as a contemporary stage of peripheral economy also based on relative surplus value and increase productivity, giving little theoretical importance to production based on absolute surplus value. The penetration of industrial and financial capital, at least in some peripheral countries would tend to accelerate the production of relative surplus value, intensifying the degree of development of productive forces. Unemployment generated in contraction phases of the business cycle would be reversed in expansive cycles, as in advanced countries. The overcoming of dependency to Cardoso, and in this consists the core of his propositions, is an act of political will that can overcome "the notary protection policies to the fractions of old and reactionary Latin American bourgeoisie", supported by autocratic national states. (Paiva, 2008).

Cardoso walks, in this sense, for a theory of interdependence, which would replace the old opposition between capitalist development and dependency, since the peripheral economy has reached a certain level of domestic capital accumulation through the formation of an economy with a base industrial more or less diversified.

Cardoso's optimism as to overcome the dependency conditions leads him to reject another important theme for Marxist theorists of dependency: the central notion of the overexploitation of labor as the basis of peripheral capitalism. In his opinion, in this proposition would be unduly articulated distinct stages and social processes of a social relationship of necessity that no more have any connection between them. The overexploitation of labor in Marini would be a remnant of the "doctrine" of "accumulation of backwardness" by Andre G. Frank, or rather, in the words of Cardoso, this author would find it a more elaborate version, namely the idea that wage control and regressive distribution of income are essential conditions for capitalist accumulation in this type of development with accumulating of poverty and growing misery.

(...) Those who take this argument to extremes consider that the limiting consequences of this style of development lies in the restricted individual consumption of workers, since the essential contradiction of Latin American of dependency is the accumulation based in the super-exploitation of workers. Thus, the movement of capital and the realization of surplus value would be slowed by the shaping of the superepxlotación. (Cardoso & MAGNANI, 1974, p. 07)

Therefore, such arguments, false and indeterminate in its formulation, would complement those previously outlined that highlighted the tendency to stagnation due to lack of consumer market, where the output would be the capitalist expansion of exports and sub-imperialism. Marx had shown in his critique of Ricardo that the key to expanding the scale of capitalist accumulation is the growing introduction of technologies that tend to increase the constant part of capital in proportion to the variable. It is the competition among the capitalists, the introduction of new technologies and the increasing expansion of the scale of accumulation that dynamize the system, and not competition among workers that takes "A decrease in the relative cost of labor." (Cardoso & MAGNANI, 1974).

Is true that in certain stages (in the beginning accumulation periods), the extension of the working day plays an important role accumulation. (...) But generalize this argument to other stages, when the dynamics of accumulation is based on the clear exploitation of the relative surplus value and the rate increased organic composition of capital, represents a anachronism. (Cardoso & MAGNANI, 1974, p. 08).

Thus, according to Cardoso, the alleged dialectical dependence becomes a theory of laws (need) of succession of stages or cycles of accumulation, in which it fails to capture the emergence of new social processes. Thus, the Marxist theory of dependency would configure a method frozen in an arsenal of categories that hinder the correct characterization of reality and hence the inability to propose an appropriate policy of social transformation.

But Cardoso do not sees that TMD postulates that the realization of surplus value is a function of the spending decisions of capitalist between accumulation and individual consumption himself, not interfering, for this purpose, the expenditures of workers. So, overexploitation implies, paradoxically, not devaluation of the workforce, since the tendency to the limited development of the productive forces in those branches that reproduce the value of the workforce is in line with a relatively low degree of labour productivity compared to other branches (sumptuary and capital goods).

As desventuras da dialética da dependência (The misadventures of the dialectic of dependence) was an article written for four hands by Fernando Henrique Cardoso and José Serra, published in 1978, and had as the goal of "closing the false exits" that are supposed in the Marini's works to socialist political forces in Brazil and Latin America. The authors referred to the political choice of armed struggle. Stand out in this text the aggressive and inelegant posture of the authors, distorting Marini's arguments while incurring in theoretical errors of the point of view of the Marxist analysis of capitalism. The Cardoso and Serra's "critical", however, exerted enormous influence on the intellectual means and its echoes seem to persist to the present day. (Prado, 2010; Wagner, 2005).

Marini's response to his "unfortunate critics" entitled *As razões do neodesenvolvimentismo (The reasons for the neo-development)* (response to Fernando Henrique Cardoso and José Serra), had not even been published in the same brazilian journal, which only came to be held in that same year in an extraordinary edition of the Revista Mexicana de Sociologia, containing the two articles. This fact contributed to what we call the lasting "conspiracy of silence" around his work in Brazil, besides the serious misunderstanding of the intellectual production of this important Brazilian social scientist of the twentieth century, whose works remains relatively little known. We do not intend to exhaust this debate, considering the multiple dimensions and variables involved. However, we understand its enormous importance, because it revealed distinctive features of methodological principles and analysis of the Brazilian and Latin American authors among those who can really help us understand the ways and theory options and divergent policies assumed by them in the course of our recent history. It not only reveals a particular historical moment, but can too shed valuable clues as to reflect the present and future of capitalism on the continent and particularly in Brazil.

Cardoso and Serra (1978, p. 35), in his critique of theoretical-methodological and policy for the Marxist dependency theory, treat the work of Marini as a sub-product of lower expression of dogmatism of certain Marxist left. Rejecting the possibility of a "general theory of peripheral capitalist system" based on the concept of overexploitation of labor and concerned to establish a more solid foundation for the ways of socialism, something that would sound ironic to the current postures of the two current authors, Cardoso Serra (1978, p. 37) forward its critical's proposals for the assumptions of the theoretical production of Marini.

Without denying the validity in the evaluative plane of socialist alternative, let's see where is based on the Marini's the analytical option. That is, we examine the theoretical strength of the dialectic of dependence as a explanatory method to discern the 'laws of motion' that relate and explain the processes and phenomena mentioned above. We affirm, therefore, that the eventual destruction of some or even all of the major assumptions of the theories of Marini does not imply the impossibility of socialism. Luckily for this (and the dominated classes of Latin America) there are other, and more solid arguments to sustain, by different paths, the same result.

These and other assumptions are shared by many other critics, as Mantega (1984 and 1997), which, itself included in a group named "the new left", expresses its profound disagreement with the "Marxists", ie, Ruy Mauro Marini, Theotônio dos Santos and André Gunder Frank. The alleged "mental rigidity" of Marini's and Marxist dependency authors' thought would have led by tortuous interpretations of the socio-political-economic reality of Latin America and Brazil that culminated in the catastrophic view of the development of underdevelopment. Marked by excessive economic reductionism, the analyses of these authors about the possibilities of development of capitalism in the region are identified with the theses of stagnationist and underconsumptionists, notably advocated by CEPAL's structuralism.

Marini (2000) responds to Cardoso and Serra (1978) demonstrating that the contradiction between production and individual consumption "arises from the very nature of capitalism" (2000, p.234), and that his impulse to unlimited accumulation often clashes with the disproportionality between the branches of the production and the antagonistic conditions of the distribution. These conditions determine the narrow limits in which the consumption of the masses may vary. What Marini seek to demonstrate is how the general law of accumulation, which causes the polarization between wealth and poverty in capitalist society is only effective in the radical structural conditions of peripheral economies.

Marini is concerned not only with domestic demand, but with global demand that dependent capitalist production requires. (Marini, 2000, p.191). As already noted earlier, the introduction of technological progress is translated into exploitation of the worker under the conditions of reproduction of the capital in dependent economies. Technical progress, mainly applied to industrial sectors oriented to consumption of the high sphere, does not translate into higher profits through of a increased rate of surplus value, but mainly by increasing the mass of value, ie, the amount of manufactured products, leading to a large problem of realization in the Latin America economies.

The restriction of the domestic market contrasts with the increasing need to perform mass value, this contradiction cannot be resolved by expanding the sphere of high consumption within dependent economy. The overexploitation of labor, made possible by the huge reserve army of labor, represents a compression of wages and blocks the creation of demand for luxury goods by workers, limiting to capitalists and the high middle class the realization of luxury goods and then the need to expand abroad the capital cycle, now on an industrial basis. The realization of some of these commodities in the world market by exporting both essential goods and sumptuary products would be the exit to the internal difficulties of realization of dependent production based on overexploitation of labor.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is not possible to treat in this brief pages all aspects of Marxist theory of dependency. However, this article sought to expose its essential core, using the category of overexploitation of labor as a guideline. We observed that many criticisms against the TMD and in particular the work of Ruy Mauro Marini, depart from theoretical and methodological confusions that led many of its formulators to reverse and distort their arguments. How recognizes Marini himself, his dialectical theory of dependency only sought to sketch the outlines of a way of interpreting the laws that govern the development of capitalism in the periphery of the system. The concept of overexploitation acts, in this theoretical-interpretative construction as key concept, though not exclusively, to understand the dynamics of dependent social formations whose tasks of updating and deepening would fit on to future generations of researchers.

The Marxist theorists of dependency not postulated the impossibility of capitalist development in the countries of the subcontinent. In this sense, it is not correct the proposition of Cardoso in the opposite direction and a more careful analysis does not admit this conclusion. The point is that the contradictions of this process are even more severe in the periphery, which is very different than affirm that it is impossible. Hence the metaphorical tone of Marini's replica, comparing Serra and Cardoso to the characters of Miguel de Cervantes, who build their windmills to then knock them down. Actually and properly TMD theorists asserted the possibility of economic and industrial growth in capitalist bases in Latin America, including projecting the internalization of industrial cycles in these economies.

REFERENCES

BRESSER, Luis Carlos. *As três interpretações da dependência*. Perspectivas, São Paulo, v. 38, p. 17-48, jul./dez. 2010.

CARDOSO, F. Henrique & SERRA, José. *As desventuras da dialética da dependência*. In: Estudos Cebrap 23. São Paulo: Cebrap, s/d, p. 33-80.

_____, F. Henrique & MAGNANI, José Guilherme C.. *Las Contradicciones del Desarrollo Asociado*. Desarrollo Económico Vol XIV N°53. Vol. 14, No. 53 (Apr. - Jun., 1974), pp. 3-32. <http://pt.scribd.com/doc/72305050/Cardoso-Las-Contradiccions-Del-Desarrollo-Asociado>. Acessado em 20/10/2011.

DIEESE. Nota Técnica nº 106, 2012.

DOS SANTOS, Theotonio. *Evolução histórica do Brasil. Da colônia à crise da 'nova república'*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1995.

_____, Theotonio. *Os Fundamentos Teóricos do Governo Fernando Henrique Cardoso*. 1994 <http://www.reggen.org.br/midia/documentos/osfundamentosteoricosdogovfhc.pdf>. Acessado em 15/10/2011.

FURTADO, C. *O capitalismo global*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1998.

LUXEMBURGO, Rosa. *A Acumulação do Capital*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1988.

MANDEL, Ernest. *O Capitalismo Tardio*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1982.

MANTEGA, G. *A economia política brasileira*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes, 1984.

_____, Guido. *Teoria da dependência revisitada – um balanço crítico*. Relatório de Pesquisa. N° 27. São Paulo. FGV, 1997.

MARINI, R. M. *Dialética da Dependência*. In: SADER, Emir (Org.). *Uma antologia da obra de Ruy Mauro Marini*. Petrópolis: Rio de Janeiro: Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2000.

_____. *Processo e tendências da globalização capitalista*. In: SADER, Emir (Org.). *Uma antologia da obra de Ruy Mauro Marini*. Petrópolis: Rio de Janeiro: Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 2000.

_____. “*Plusvalia extraordinária y acumulación de capital*”, Cuadernos políticos, número 20, Ediciones Era, México, abril-junio de 1979b, pp. 18-39.

_____. *El ciclo del capital en la economía dependiente*. Mercado y dependencia, Ursula Oswald (Coord.), Nueva Imagen, México, 1979a, pp. 37-55. http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/008_%20ciclo_es.htm. Acessado em 25/07/2011.

_____. *La acumulación capitalista mundial e el subimperialismo*. Cuadernos Políticos n. 12, Ediciones Era, México, abril-junio de 1977. http://www.marini-escritos.unam.mx/006_acumulacion_es.htm. Acessado em 25/07/2011.

_____. *As razões do neo-desenvolvimentismo (resposta a Fernando Henrique Cardoso e José Serra)*. In: *Dialética da Dependência*. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes/Clacso/LPP, 2000, p.167-243.

_____. *Memória*. In: TRANSPADINI, R. & STEDILE, J. P.(orgs.). *Ruy Mauro Marini: Vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

MARTINS, Carlos Eduardo e VALENCIA, Adrián Sotelo. *A teoria da dependência e o pensamento econômico brasileiro – crítica a Bresser e Mantega*. III Congresso. SEP, 1998.

MARTINS, Carlos Eduardo. *Ruy Mauro Marini: marco del pensamiento contemporáneo*. In: América Latina, dependencia y globalización. Fundamentos conceptuales Ruy Mauro Marini. Antología y presentación Carlos Eduardo Martins. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre - CLACSO, 2008.

MARX, Karl. *O Capital: crítica da economia política. O processo de produção do capital* - v. 1, t.2. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1988. (Col. Os Economistas).

_____. *O Capital: crítica da economia política. O processo de produção do capital* -v. 1, t.2. O São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1985. (Col. Os Economistas).

_____. *O Capital: crítica da economia política. O processo global da produção capitalista* - v. 3, t. 1. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1984. (Col. Os Economistas).

MIGLIOLI, J. *Acumulação de capital e demanda efetiva*. São Paulo: T.A. Queiroz, 1993.

OSORIO, Jaime. *Crítica de la Economía Vulgar: reproducción del capital y dependencia*. México: Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, 2004.

OSÓRIO, Jaime. *Dependência e superexploração*. In: SADER, Emir e DOS SANTOS, Theotonio (Coord.); MARTINS, Carlos Eduardo e VALENCIA, Adrian Sotelo (Orgs.). *A América Latina e os*

Desafios da Globalização. Ensaio Dedicados a Ruy Mauro Marini. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio; São Paulo: Boitempo, 2009.

PAIVA, Carlos Águedo. *Fernando Henrique Cardoso: o antidependentista*. Ensaio FEE, Porto Alegre, v. 29, n. 1, p. 157-178, jun. 2008.

PRADO, Fernando Correa. *História de um não-debate: a trajetória da teoria marxista da dependência no Brasil*. XVI Encontro Nacional de Economia Política, 2010.

ROSDOLSKY, Roman. *Estrutura e Gênese de O Capital de Karl Marx*. Rio de Janeiro: EDUERJ: Contraponto, 2001.

SADER, Emir e DOS SANTOS, Theotônio (Coord.); MARTINS, Carlos Eduardo e VALENCIA, Adrian Sotelo (Orgs.). *A América Latina e os Desafios da Globalização. Ensaio Dedicados a Ruy Mauro Marini*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio; São Paulo: Boitempo, 2009.

SADER Emir (org.) *Dialetica da dependência*. Vozes/ CLACSO, 2000.

TRANSPADINI, R. & STEDILE, J. P.(orgs.). *Ruy Mauro Marini: Vida e obra*. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.

WAGNER, Adolfo, *Dois caminhos para o capitalismo dependente brasileiro: o debate entre Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Ruy Mauro Marini*, Dissertação de Mestrado em Ciência Política, UFRJ, 2005.