

*THE SOUTH'S THOUGHTS ON DEVELOPMENT:  
LINKS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA\**

LOS PENSAMIENTOS DEL SUR SOBRE DESARROLLO:  
ENLACES ENTRE AMÉRICA LATINA Y ÁFRICA

*Cristina Frões de Borja Reis*  
Universidade Federal do ABC, Brasil  
Technische Universität Berlin  
froesdeborjareis@tu-berlin.de

*Muryatan Santana Barbosa*  
Universidade Federal do ABC, Brasil  
m.barbosa@ufabc.edu.br

*Fernanda Graziella Cardoso*  
Universidade Federal do ABC, Brasil  
fernanda.cardoso@ufabc.edu.br

Recibido: febrero de 2018; aceptado: octubre de 2018

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to epistemologically and interdisciplinary review the evolution of the concept of Development in the thoughts of the South, considering Latin American and African regions. It is presented a survey including the pioneers of Development Economics in the 1940s and 1950s, the Latin American theories of developmentalism and of dependency in the 1960s and 1970s, the theories of pan-Africanism in the 1960s and 1970s, and finally the reflection on the concept of development today considering the new center/ periphery relations, the links between Latin American and African thoughts and the topicality of its unquietness.

*Keywords:* Development; Epistemology; Global South; Center-Periphery; Pan-Africanism.

## RESUMEN

Este trabajo tiene como objetivo la revisión epistemológica e interdisciplinaria de la evolución del concepto de Desarrollo en los pensamientos del Sur, considerando las regiones América Latina y África. Se presenta un *survey* que incluye a los pioneros de la Economía del Desarrollo en las décadas de 1940 y 1950, las teorías latinoamericanas del desarrollismo y la dependencia en las décadas de 1960 y 1970, las teorías panafricanistas en las desde 1950 hasta 1970, y finalmente la reflexión sobre el concepto de desarrollo de hoy considerando las nuevas relaciones centro / periferia, los enlaces del pensamiento de América Latina y África y la actualidad de sus inquietudes.

*Palabras clave:* Desarrollo; Epistemología; Sul Global; Centro-Periferia; Panafricanismo.

*JEL:* O1, O0, B3, F4.

\* This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001.



## 1. INTRODUCTION

Development is a concept under construction and probably will always be so, due to the dynamism in which the world society and economy keep on changing values, needs and aspirations over time. After the World War II, the concept of development and its related discussions were closely associated to the most urgent social problems at that time, taking developed countries as reference for living standards and productive achievements. One after another, the main concerns regarding development were economic growth, industrialization, income and wealth distribution, innovation, human capabilities, environmental sustainability, social inclusion.

During the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s some theoretical approaches arose out of the mainstream in Economics focusing its analysis on the underdeveloped countries, bringing up developmental policies that have put in motion the world periphery. Regardless varying degree of success on the advance of productive forces, those policies were often not enough to promote economic catch-up and, moreover, had many adverse effects. To a large extent, important social struggles of each context were even absent in its concerns, so that many development ideas were actually marginalizing gender, racial, ethnic, cultural, and geospatial inequalities. However there have always been voices of the Global South critically thinking on development, with disruptive approaches from Eurocentrism and economicism. That sort of South's thoughts came up with development ideas and attitudes that prioritized people's values and culture, more balanced power and wealth relations, and better interactions between society and nature.

Thus, considering the "under construction" character of development, our paper aims to epistemologically and interdisciplinary review the evolution of this concept in the thoughts of Latin America and Africa after the II World War.<sup>1</sup> In order to accomplish this objective, it is presented a comprehensive survey that provides a panorama of some its main ideas about economic development in three historical phases. Firstly, the from now on called "classical economic development" launched by the pioneers of Development Economics in the 1940s and 1950s, later taken by the developmentalism and the dependency

<sup>1</sup> It must be observed that our intention is not to review all the contributions of the Global South, despite other regions also have fabulous contribution, because African and Latin-American thoughts are the focus of this paper. We believe that our original contribution is to show how they were similar, complementary and fruitful for thinking on development in the XXI century.

theories in the 1960s and 1970s in Latin America. Secondly, the pan-African development theories of prominent intellectuals in the 1960s and 1970s, discussing whether this literature represented a rupture with the European civilizational and developmental models. Thirdly it is presented how the structuralist literature since the eighties reconcile the main concerns of Southern thoughts and the current complexity of the world economy, especially regarding the reconfiguration of global value chains (GVC) and new center/ periphery relations. The conclusions resume an epistemological reflection about a concept of development for nowadays in the light of South thoughts from postwar years until the last two decades in the world economy, emphasizing the links between African and Latin American views and the topicality of its unquietness.

## 2. DEVELOPMENTALISM AND DEPENDENCY THEORIES IN LATIN AMERICA

With the emergence of modern economic theories following the World War II, growth theories and development theories began to be adjoined to the problematic situation of developed nations in the first instance, and to that of underdeveloped nations in the second. Implicit in this distinction would be a perspective whereby the former undeveloped nations could finally avail themselves of Economic Theory and its effective principles in their most traditional form. Given the theoretical-methodological inadequacy of the neoclassical economic approach in dealing with complex phenomena (Keynes, 1936; Kalecki, 1954), such as processes related to economic development, a thematic thread outside the core of the mainstream was formed specifically to discuss cases of underdevelopment persistence. A number of authors known as pioneers of development initiated, then, modern Development Economics (Arndt, 1987).

From the perspective of Development Economics, and later of the Latin American structural developmentalism, there was a tendency to associate, necessarily, economic development to industrialization. In order to avoid the vulnerability of primary-exporting nations evident during the Great Depression and World War II (formalized in the Singer-Prebisch thesis in 1949-1950, as described ahead), industrialization was taken as a means for transforming the import and export profile of underdeveloped nations, promoting economic diversification, and increasing productivity. Therefore, as Arndt (1987) points out, there was a common identification of the need for planning, and then, of the crucial role of the State in this process. In addition to the need for planning, and derived from List's "infant industry" argument, the adoption of protectionist policies constituted one pillar of the developmentist strategy, which culminated in the State-led industrialization based on import substitution. Developmentalism can be defined as an ideology and accumulation strategy predominantly coordinated by the National States, whose different routes and methods of implementation depended on initial factor endowments, income distribution, size of economy and its geopolitical insertion (Medeiros, 2013).



Raul Prebisch (1901, Argentina - 1986, Chile) was one of the first Latin-American thinkers to criticize the theory of economic convergence based on trade specialization in comparative advantages<sup>2</sup>. Economist from the Faculty of Economic Sciences in Buenos Aires, Prebisch took many office jobs, abroad and in his country, such as at the National Statistical Office, Banco de la Nacion (BNA), and the Secretary of Finance in the military government of General José Felix Uriburu in 1930. The Argentinean economist was anti-communist and promoted the private sector throughout his career, though he was under surveillance by the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) (Dosman, 2008).

Considered a structural developmentalist, the Argentinean economist, together with the Brazilian economists Celso Furtado and, later, Maria da Conceição Tavares, build the pillars of the thoughts disseminated by Economic Commission of Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).<sup>3</sup> Created in 1949 as a regional council of the newly born United Nations (UN), its second secretary general was Raul Prebisch, who was responsible for the publication in 1950 of the ECLAC's first document analyzing the economic reality of Latin America. For a long time, the document was the basis for discussion of both the evolution and the development prospects of the region, under the perspective of center-periphery relationships (Pinto, 2012).

Center was composed by countries that were in the epicenter of world economic cycles, related to technological progress; while the periphery were the countries that absorb the effects of that process. In this context, there was an intrinsic tendency for the center to take greater benefits of the international trade in comparison to the periphery, what would lead to an increasing income gap among them.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, the periphery was condemned to have difficulties to pay its external commitments due to the vulnerability of its exports and investment cycle to the external demand and to the international capital liquidity, especially in the context of weak internal markets so that the

2 The theory of comparative advantages, both in the original concept of David Ricardo and in the neoclassical Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson model, has the general conclusion that a country must specialize in activities whose production is intensive in the more abundant input (capital or labour) in comparison to the other countries. If all countries do so, the theory states that the most efficient allocation of resources would happen, enlarging the total amount of products available, by the lowest cost. And this would, in addition, lead to the international convergence of input prices and income levels (Baldwin, 2008).

3 A number of other prominent intellectuals could be remembered here, from various Latin-American countries, such as Anibal Pinto, Osvaldo Sunkel, Juan Noyola Vásquez, José Medina Echavarría and Fernando Fajnzylber (Bresser-Pereira, 2011; Bielschowsky, 2016).

4 This is because, on the one hand, the technological progress associated to manufacturing production in the center would generate rise in productivity, which would increase the profit of its exports, given the assumption of higher income elasticity of manufactured in relation to primary products. On the other hand, the rises in productivity of the periphery would necessarily be translated into reduction in prices (due to the income inelasticity of the demand of primary products). Then the exports of the periphery would need a higher growth rate than the one of the periphery's exports, in order to avoid trade account imbalances (and current account, considering the prevalence of the golden standard for the exchange rate).

development was towards outside the economy (*desarrollo hacia fuera*) – like Furtado (1962) and Tavares (1972) emphasized.

Celso Furtado (1920-2004, Brazil) was an economist, professor with about 30 books translated into more than 10 languages, and a remarkable performance as public man, director of the National Bank of Economic Development, Minister of Planning (1962-63) and Minister of Culture (1986-88). Maria da Conceição Tavares, born in Portugal but naturalized Brazilian, is mathematician and economist, professor, deputy in the nineties and author of many publications on development. According to them and to other Latin American structuralist thinkers, the abysmal regional and class disparities within underdeveloped countries, translated and reinforced by the great inequality of income and wealth distribution, are rooted in both structural and institutional issues ranging from the cultural-social sphere (which relates the society to a sort of intellectual subsumption of the labour force through information networks and technology in general), to the economic-political sphere (for example, the macroeconomic regime shaped by financial markets, property rights in favor of concentration of power of large financial, industrial and rural groups). The development policy should be, therefore, essentially qualitative. As a guideline for action, Furtado always pointed to the importance of making the country's structures more elastic, through the implementation of various reforms - administrative, budgetary, banking and agrarian. Particularly, the agrarian issue has persistently been a challenge at the core of income and wealth inequalities to overcome the structural heterogeneity - understood as the persistence of an export sector of high wages and productivity as opposed to a poor subsistence agriculture that feeds a large part of the domestic population. Therefore, in the developmentalist view of Prebisch and Furtado, the key mechanism for structural change in the periphery would be redirecting the gains from the increase in the primary export sectors' productivity by state policies. However, in order to achieve improvements in the living standards of the population as a whole, redistributive policies and reform for profound social transformation would be necessary. Otherwise, the benefits of structural change would be appropriated only by the elites, perpetuating and even accentuating existing inequalities and disparities (Cardoso & Reis, 2018).

Furtado, Prebisch and other developmentalists have suggested the regional integration in Latin America as a possible solution for Latin American industrialization's limits, contradicting conventional theory of foreign trade. Prebisch defended the shift in the pattern of exports and specialization, towards regional diversification, in order to avoid imports from outside the region. Regionalization would reduce local production (and importing substitution industrialization in all countries), allowing for intra-industrial specialization that would increase gains of scale and competitiveness. Ultimately, regional joint-industrialization would contribute to the reduction of balance of payments' constraint, enabling higher growth rates. However, the regionalization would not work if all the countries were primary exporters to the center, and when productive complementarities, regional infrastructure and dynamism in



domestic markets were lacking. Alternatively, regionalization is more likely to be successful (promoting structural change and fighting inequalities) when countries have similar productive structures and there are compensatory redistribution schemes that alleviate asymmetric results that tend to benefit the richest and most industrialized countries of the region (Medeiros, 2008).

Indeed, in the periphery, different patterns of developmentalism led by the State were observed in the first post-war decades, but in general in Latin America growth and industrialization did not bring redistribution, nor has regional integration become true. Moreover, already in the 1960s, there were signs of exhaustion in this economic model of industrialization led by the state so that many criticisms emerged (Fiori, 1999). A period of marked pessimism began among intellectuals, not only on the viability of industrialization and modernization projects, but also on whether it was possible for “backward economies” to reach development – especially under authoritarian governments risen after military coups. In this context, theories on dependency emerged as counterpoints to classical developmentalism. Like Sunkel (1967) argued, beyond the dominant oligarchy and the rural of underdeveloped economies, there were emerging urban working classes, industrial bourgeoisie and new public bureaucracy that enabled alliances for renewed national development projects. However and still, the dependency and alienation of the middle classes were translated in the replication of the consumer patterns of the center, thus revealing their own contradictory character and the difficulty of driving a national development process (Bresser-Pereira, 2011).

Notably, dependence may not be understood as unique concept, nor a theory or a strategy of development, but a sociological and political interpretation of Latin America that competed against the national-bourgeoisie interpretation, such as suggested by Bresser-Pereira (2011). It came to criticize the developmentalist view of ECLAC, especially Prebisch's, from the standpoint of the Marxist debate on imperialism and monopolistic capitalism, in which its most prominent authors, Baran & Sweezy (1966), show that the capitalism had evolved to world relationships lead by giant anonymous society corporations with mono/ oligopolic power. The dependency theories' basic idea is that there were deep relationships between local elites from the periphery and the center, which resulted not only in the replication of consumption, but also education, ideology and cultural standards in the former, but also business connections and financial common interests.<sup>5</sup>

Dependency was taken in general by neo-Marxists as a subordinated relation intrinsic to the functioning of the inter-state capitalist system that is necessarily

<sup>5</sup> The dependency theories had a couple of streams of thoughts, that Blomstrom & Heltne (1984) resume in four: a) the auto-criticism of the developmentalism – including Furtado and Sunkel, already presented; b) the “neo-marxist” interpretation of Ruy Mauro Marini, Vania Bambirra, Theotonio dos Santos, in special; c) the associated dependency version of Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto; d) and the view of Andre Gunder Frank, actually the founder of the term, but who did not consider himself as orthodox nor neo-marxist. This suggestion of classification received some criticisms, such as Frank (1991) review.

asymmetric and results in the underdevelopment of the periphery.<sup>6</sup> Dependency is not only an external phenomenon but it is manifested also under different forms in the internal structure (social, ideological and political). Theotonio dos Santos (1936-2018, Brazil), sociologist, political scientist and economist from Brazil, one of the most internationally cited Latin American intellectuals, was one of the main thinkers of the dependency Marxist theory, together with Vania Bambirra (1940-2015, also Brazilian sociologist, political scientist and economist). According to Dos Santos (1970), dependence has many historic forms, but the “new dependency” was shaped by the interests of capital markets in special, as the world economic relations were based on monopolistic control of large-scale capital, on control of certain economic and financial centers over others, on a monopoly of a complex technology that leads to unequal and combined development at a national and international level. In the view of Gunder Frank (1991), the original cause of underdevelopment was the capitalism itself, and its imperialistic division of the world in producers of manufactured and primary goods. Under this context, while in the center the workers were just exploited (as in Marx’s theory), in the periphery they were over-exploited, not only by the local dependent bourgeoisie but also by the imperial center (Marini, 1972). Bambirra (1972) assumes, too, that the development of capitalism in Latin America was inserted in the general laws of accumulation that were expanding the world’s capitalism, emphasizing the specific types of dependent capitalism in Latin America, varying according to the general framework of exporting economies, independency processes and political regimes, wars and civil conflicts, industrialization opportunities, etc. – so that the internal determinants should also be analyzed in order to understand the social-economic path of the countries in the periphery. As a general conclusion, for the Marxist dependency thinkers, there was no reasons for believing that reforms promoted by national bourgeoisie would deeply reduce inequalities in underdeveloped countries; so that the alternative was the socialist revolution.

The idea of (indo) Latin revolution was actually not new in the region, being proposed enthusiastically by some thinkers before, such as Carlos Mariategui in the 1920s.<sup>7</sup> The Peruvian journalist and founder of the Socialist Party in Peru convoked the Latin-American people for building socialism based on their own material and institutional conditions – including culture. Nonetheless, the

6 “The history of Latin American underdevelopment is the history of the world capitalism system development” (Marini, 1983: 3). “By dependence we mean a situation in which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected. The relation of inter dependence between two or more economies, and between these and world trade, assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant ones) can expand and can be self-sustaining, while other countries (the dependent ones) can do this only as a reflection of that expansion, which can have either a positive or a negative effect on their immediate development” (Dos Santos, 1970: 61).

7 “No queremos, ciertamente, que el socialismo sea en América calco y copia. Debe ser creación heroica. Tenemos que dar vida, con nuestra propia realidad, en nuestro propio lenguaje, al socialismo indoamericano. He aquí una misión digna de una generación nueva (Mariátegui, 1928 *apud* Handler, 2012: 1)



criticism about adopting foreign – mainly European - standards for development in the periphery was not the core of most thoughts on development and dependency in Latin America as it was on the decolonization theories of Asia and Africa. In th Latin America, it was only later strengthened by Enrique Dussel<sup>8</sup> and Anibal Quijano<sup>9</sup>.

“The associated dependency interpretation of Cardoso & Faletto (1969), emphasized the exploitation of classes more than the exploitation of nations. In light of the industrial development faced in Latin America countries, especially under authoritarian military dictatorships, they identified “a new political pact that united the state’s technocrats with industrial entrepreneurs and multinationals and radically excluded workers, (...)concentrating income”,<sup>10</sup> so that actually there was no national bourgeoisie, just as Gunder Frank has said before. But instead of suggesting revolution, Cardoso & Faletto (1969, [1979]) accepted the possibility of reconciling dependent development with the representative democracy in order to struggle against an authoritarian state, supported especially by a “state bourgeoisie” that supported corporative interests. In order to change power composition in favor of democratic ideals, the authors preferred the path of economic openness, believing that the inflow of foreign direct investment would finance capital accumulation in the periphery and create a modern model of economic growth. The problem was, however, that the liberal project would never be interested in raising people’s power, by the way foreign interests were always present in the region and did not openly strengthen popular aspirations. Some years later, the opening strategy was applied by the economic public policies following Washington Consensus in the nineties (including in Brazil, with Cardoso in the presidency) in the Global South (not only in Latin America). Their immediate consequence was the increase,

8 “Enrique Dussel, que ha tematizado asiduamente el problema del eurocentrismo, afirmaba que el “ego cogito moderno fue antecedido en más de un siglo por el ego conquiro” (2000, 48). Porque la gestación misma de la identidad moderna, como discurso y como práctica, se halla indisolublemente vinculada al ejercicio del colonialismo.(...) América Latina siempre fue “leída” desde la cosmovisión europea, y así sucedió desde los tiempos de las “crónicas de Indias” (pero también en el siglo XIX, cuando la intelectualidad de las jóvenes repúblicas recientemente constituidas no podía pensar su propia realidad sino desde un paradigma positivista y europeizante). Y precisamente porque la Modernidad aparece inextricablemente unida al orden colonial, los saberes europeos adquieren el estatus de “universalmente válidos” a través de un movimiento que al mismo tiempo subalterniza cualquier otro saber; un movimiento cuya última ratio fue la violencia material y simbólica. Como bien señalaba Dussel, es preciso que esta modernidad, que es ínsitamente colonial, quede desenmascarada; es imprescindible que su inocencia civilizatoria sea desmentida, para que la culpabilidad de sus víctimas pueda quedar exonerada (2000, 49)” (Polo Blanco, 2018: 116).

9 “In the early 1990s the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano began to develop a very suggestive response that somehow came to complement or enrich everything that had previously been analyzed by Marxist thinkers and dependency theorists. Quijano’s ideas generated a new framework for the interpretation of modernity in the light of Latin American historical and cultural experience, and the category of coloniality was erected as the epistemic core that more clearly revealed the intimate typically structure of the modern power. A coloniality that turned out to be, indeed, the modern world-system’s imaginary envelope forged in the beginning of the sixteenth century (Quijano and Wallerstein 1992)” (Polo Blanco, 2018: 114, our translation).

10 Bresser-Pereira, 2011: 51.

instead of improvement, of social unbalances, besides not stimulating growth (Chang, 2002).

The developmentalism and the dependency theories have become known world-wide since the 1970s. According to Dos Santos (2015), after the first paper that presented the dependency theory as a new scientific paradigm of thought from the South (Bodenheimer, 1970), it started to be a method of social analysis in the Caribe (Girvan, 1973), Africa (Amin, 1974), Asia<sup>11</sup> (Baghshi & Todaro, 1977; Ngo Man Lan, 1977). Even in the , both in United States and Europe the dependency theory (and also the theology of liberation<sup>12</sup>) influenced left-wing thought, especially culminating in the World-System<sup>15</sup> analysis of Wallerstein (1974) and Arrighi (1994). The World System analysis, which was also influenced by Ferdinand Braudel, is considered the theoretical expression of the dependentist debate considering the changes that took place in the world economy and politics from the seventies on. It retakes the tradition of the great explanatory theories with the objective of interpreting the capitalism and its cycles in the contemporary world, as part of a joint effort of the humanity to overcoming the exploitative, expropriator, concentrative and excluding structure of the World-System.

The construction of this theory started during the intermission to the globalization era, when occurred a profound shift in public and intellectual opinion on development. It claimed for the incorporation of what could be generically called social goals such as health, education, nutrition and freedom (Arndt, 1987; Sen, 2000). It was not just a matter of adding social goals to economic results, but also of questioning whether certain types of growth could actually cause political and social problems. In the following decades, the concerns for environmental sustainability were strengthened, serving further to defy the development process, and even its desirability... something already questioned by the African thinkers, as shown ahead.

### 3. AN AFRICAN LOOK AT THE PROBLEM OF DEVELOPMENT

In the 1950s in African nations, the general idea on development was that, primarily, the interests of the public and private sectors should be united in the formation of an industrialized nation, in which the State would have a strong

11 "In Asia, particularly in India, there was already a long tradition of anti-imperialist criticism for formulating own development paths. But these proposals, although more openly supported in planning of the disjunctive between traditional and modern, between delay and development, while recognizing the economic, social and culturally positive aspects of Indian culture. Gandhi had mainly supported its anti-imperialist mass mobilization in the recognition of the values of Indian culture, among which was not only non-violence but also the autonomous and artisanal production and the Hindu community (idem:38, our translation).

12 According to Enrique Dussel, the theology of liberation has been influenced by the Neo-marxist view of dependency, especially in what regards the center-center-periphery division and its transfer of an enormous capital gain from the periphery to the center-center-center (Carrete, 2014).

13 See section 3.



participation in the economy. This was the project of “decolonization”, which meant almost the same in all parts of Africa, implying: a) centralization of state power, with a single party and intervention in the economy; b) modernization of the agro-export (and mineral) sector; and c) industrialization (Amin, 2006).<sup>14</sup> That “recipe” was not absurd, indeed it brought some reasonable results of better living standards and average growth rate of 5% in the majority of independent African countries between 1945 and 1973 (Nyerere, 1997). But a difficult issue was about the role of public and private initiatives during the industrialization process, as well as the role of the ancient metropolis. Many of the serious political crisis in Africa in the 60's and 70's decades were born due to the conflicts of interests about these issues.

In this context, perhaps the first prominent author to put forward an original idea on the subject was the well-known multidisciplinary thinker (physicist, historian, linguist, Egyptologist) Cheikh Anta Diop. In the context of the pan-Africanist ideal of the time (liberation, integration, solidarity and African personality), Diop (1956) argued that economic policy should necessarily follow the inherent post-national continentalist ideal. This is because only with planning on such a scale could the industrial development fit to the natural (in particular, energy) characteristics and the needs of the local populations. Something like that, for him, could only arise from African unity; after all such a project was not within reach of any particular African nation.

The Senegalese economist Mamadou Dia was one of the first authors (in parallel with A. Emmanuel, author of *The Unequal Exchange*, 1962) to show that international trade increased polarization between the developed and underdeveloped countries, due to reasons similar to the Prebisch-Singer's thesis of deterioration in the terms of trade. For Dia (1954), this would be the economic side of “neo-colonialism”, a usual term at the time to refer to the continued domination of African nations by the Metropolis, even after independence. His belief was that African national economies should recreate themselves in search of “self-development,” seeking South-South trade and promoting community alternatives. This would be a dimension of what he came to see as an “African Socialism”.

The debate was not only theoretical. Dia had the opportunity to apply his ideas when he was the first minister of Senegal, just after the national independence in 1960. In the following two years, he defended a haughty and combative position against France and its local associate bourgeoisie – including the President. But Dia has lost and in 1962 was arrested (until 1974) with more 4 State ministers, indicted by organizing a coup d'état, showing how strong was still the French power in the country. It is worth remembering

<sup>14</sup> Such a recipe was not absurd. And, in fact, it brought reasonable results for most African countries in the era of world economic expansion, during the period from 1945 to 1973. The issue was the space that each of these sectors should inhabit, and what role the old Metropolis could play therein. Many of the serious political crises that hit African governments in the 1960s stemmed from views on this subject in particular.

that the immediate postcolonial period in Africa was marked by neocolonial counterrevolutions, commanded by the old metropolis (France, England), the US and the local bourgeoisie. One hard blow in this regard, for example, was the murder of Patrice Lumumba in Congo in 1960.

In Ghana, in 1966, there was another coup d'état orchestrated by the CIA against the celebrated pan-Africanist leader Kwame Nkrumah. Nkrumah's ideas were very influential at the time. For the Ghanaian leader, a broader and more radical pro-independence political struggle should be imagined in order to promote more powerful national units in Africa than those left by the borders inherited from the colonial system. In the classical work "Neocolonialism: Upper Stage of Imperialism" (1965), Nkrumah argued that neocolonialism was another face of imperialism, but without colonialism, which could be maintained by the "balkanization" and subsequent "satelization" of the former, now formally independent, colonies. This domain would be sustained primarily by the economy, through the defense of external capitalist interests and their internal partners – such as argued the Latin American Marxist dependency theorists. This would, in turn, lead to political, cultural and, where necessary, military dominance. Against neocolonialism, he said, a broad political field should be built in defense of African unity and integration, from a territorial, economic, cultural, energetic and political point of view. This, to him, was pan-Africanism: the only way in which African countries, especially those of small territorial and economic size (such as his homeland Ghana), could survive under neo-colonial pressures (Nkrumah, 1965).

Meanwhile, in Nigeria, Adebayo Adedeji - economist member of the Ministry of Economic Planning after independence in 1958 until 1963, professor at Nigeria's University of Ile Ife (now Obafemi Awolowo University), Minister of Economic Reconstruction and Development in the military regime of General Yakubu Gowon after the civil war - was one of the leaders of the five-year national development plan (1970–74). Based on the profits from oil exports, the plan meant to promote rapid industrialization and provision of infrastructure to Nigeria – though very unevenly and authoritarian (Adebajo, 2013). Like Prebisch, he disagreed about the benefits of international trade theories from the North based in comparative advantages, and had a decolonization project very similar to the Latin American author, based on modernization and industrialization financed by primary exports, and the enlargement of the regional trade, Adedeji is considered "the Father of ECOWAS (the Economic Community of West African States), according to Adebajo (2013: 20). In 1975, he became the Executive Secretary of the Addis Ababa-based Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), which reformulated the action-guide lines for socio-economic development.<sup>15</sup> Like Adebajo explains, ECA influenced

<sup>15</sup> "The ECA's Revised Framework of 1976 called for more African expertise on how to promote socio-economic development, and a move away from orthodox prescriptions on the efficacy of international trade as an engine for growth and social change. Like Prebisch, Adedeji argued against African countries continuing to export one or two primary products and importing consumer goods,



the developmental plan of the Nigerian government in 1979, called “Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa 1980–2000”; taken as reference for African development strategies from other countries and from the World Bank in the eighties.

At the same time, a woman was promoting Pan-Africanism regional integration led by ecological means, an initiative later laureated by the Nobel Peace Prize. Wangari Muta Maathai (1940-2011), from Kenya, defender of democracy, human rights and environmental conservation, was the first woman in East and Central Africa to earn a doctorate degree and to become professor and chair of the Department of Veterinary Anatomy at the University of Nairobi. While leader of the National Council of Women of Kenya, in 1986 she established a Pan African Green Belt Network, which supported woman groups to plant trees for environment conservation and for improving their life quality. Later on, Maathai occupied several prestigious positions in multilateral organizations and in Kenya politics. Another remarkable African alternative experience was in the government of Julius Nyereré (1962-1985) in Tanzania, following the Arusha Declaration of 1967, with the proclamation of Ujamaa (“family home” or “brotherhood” in Swahili). Ujamaa was a project that sought to consolidate communal and collectivist life in the villages instead of seeking an urban-industrial path. Nyereré’s proposal was not development. It was “self-reliance”; the true path towards African autonomy and socialism. It is important to say that Ujamaa was not an eccentric policy claimed by an isolated political leader. It was a political project which, in addition to leverage Tanzanians’ life standards, provided shelter for the Organization of African Unity (founded in 1963) and to various African liberation movements struggling throughout Southern Africa (South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, Northern and Southern Rhodesia). For this and other reasons, Nyereré and Ujamaa had the growing support of intellectuals from various parts of Africa, and outside Africa, during the 1970s. In particular, Dar-es-Salam University, and its environs, became the core of an international network of renowned progressive intellectuals.<sup>16</sup> In this environment, marked by the life and death of Ujamaa, new theories of African development were born (or retaken). Thus, in this environment there were thoughts in constant dialogue with the critical development theories at that time, such as the monopolistic capitalism, dependency theory, unequal exchange, underdevelopment, Marxist variants (in particular, Trotskyist and Maoist) and, especially, the radical pan-Africanism (F. Fanon, K. Nkrumah, A.

as this increased the continent’s external dependence. Both Prebisch and Adedeji also shared a passion for national planning as well as for a more effective and developmental state which could allocate resources more rationally. Adedeji criticized Africa’s failure to prioritize indigenous factor inputs, its overreliance on foreign exchange from exports for these inputs, and the lack of participation of Africa’s masses in production and consumption processes” (Adebajo, 2013: 23).

<sup>16</sup> For example, Walter Rodney, Norman Girvan, C. L. R. James, Stokely Carmichael, Andrew Gunder Frank, Immanuel Wallerstein, Claude Ake, John Iliffe, Mahmood Mamdani, Samir Amin, Issa Shivji, J. Rweyemamu, D. Nabudere and Giovanni Arrighi.

Cabral).<sup>17</sup> One of the most significant authors that appeared during this context for the African social thought is the well-known Egyptian economist Samir Amin. In his work *Cumulation on a World Scale* (1970), Amin put in motion the premise of his historical materialism reconstruction, which continues to bear fruits until nowadays. Observing actual capitalism, he sought to demonstrate that, at world scale, the center-periphery polarization was an inherent dynamic of the capital accumulation process. In his subsequent works, the thesis of polarization was reinforced by an analysis of the world character of the value law (Amin, 1994: 69). He argued that the world polarization would structurally tend to relegate peripheral nations to perpetuate themselves as so This perpetration was related to the “purchaser” character of their local bourgeoisie. However, this problem was a conditioning, and, thus, not a determinant of the polarization process. Therefore, for understanding this process, the various projects of national development in the peripheries throughout the twentieth century, coordinated by an incipient national bourgeoisie, should be revised - particularly during the period of expansion of the world economy, between 1945 and 1973, when the belief in “catch-up” became universal. However, according to the author, nationalistic bourgeois projects - developmentalism, populism, *Bandung* - would sooner or later be doomed to failure, inasmuch as they would not represent the real interest of the underclasses. This could only be guaranteed by a national-popular option whereby a continuous and long-term disconnection of the international system would materialize, aimed at self-centered and social democracy.

Two other critical theories of development, and also of modernization, gained a foothold in the African intelligentsia in the same post-1970 period: that of “endogenous development” and that of “economic decolonization”. The historian Joseph Ki-Zerbo (1962) had been reflecting on endogenous development since the 1950s,<sup>18</sup> based on the pan-Africanist thought. For him, the “African personality” was not a static or essentialist tradition, but a historical dynamic, explainable by the materio-spatial reality of the continent. He attributed to the relative isolation, the technological backwardness and the uncoded (oral) tradition, the explanation why African populations have formed a social life focused on collectivism, gerontocracy and solidarity. That is, one historical “personality” with both positive (anti-individualism, fraternity), and negative (tendentially authoritarian) tendencies. As a consequence, this personality, according to the author, would be in contradiction when facnig

<sup>17</sup> See Déves-Valdes, 2008.

<sup>18</sup> Theories of African “endogenous development” date back to the late nineteenth century. It was during this period that some pioneers of Pan-Africanism, usually Caribbean and US emigres in Africa, began to argue that in order to develop, Africans should start from their own cultural resources and traditions, rather than copying strategies extraneous to their reality. Most prominent intellectual among them was the Caribbean Edward Blyden, who lived for decades in Liberia. He was one of the first to say that African societies had civilizational values to be celebrated, an “African personality”, marked by the importance of family, collective life and common use of land and water in Africa. According to Blyden, a project to “Africanize” Africa should arise from the culture of the urban populations (native or foreign) to the rural African, the interior dweller. For him, this “Africanization” project would be a necessary step for the formation of a single state in sub-Saharan West Africa (Déves-Valdés, 2008).



the new African reality, marked by external influences especially, the values of individualism and capital accumulation. In order to overcome this situation, Ki-Zerbo points to the need to form a new "African personality", which could create an original synthesis of these two tendencies in favor of the continent's endogenous development. Something that, for him, would have to be articulated within a pan-African vision, that is, towards the unity of the continent.<sup>19</sup>

The second theory, "economic decolonization", stems from the realization that, despite all efforts to the contrary, African economies continued to reproduce the agro-export model inherited from the colonial experience during the two decades following the 1960s. So, what is left to be done? One possible answer is that the decolonization project has not yet reached Africa from the economic point of view. For Mazrui (2010), the inability of the African elites to solve this question could be explained by their colonial education, which is still reproduced in contemporary Africa. This is because, for him, colonialism would have encouraged, at best, a kind of humanistic education dissociated from technical knowledge. The author says that this would have driven, for example, the movements for decolonization, as well as practices of the arts, literature and social sciences in the continent. But it would have, on the other hand, limited the action of such elites in the construction of economic and infrastructural alternatives in the continent.

Mazrui argued that modernizing in this direction would be necessary for the African development. But for this to happen a new decolonizing praxis was required, which would be achieved from five interrelated processes in all fields of social life: a) indigenization, as a use of own resources; b) domestication, in the sense of adapting what is external to the internal; c) diversification of external dependence, production, techniques, trade, etc.; d) horizontal counterpenetration with the other countries of the Third World; e) vertical counterpenetration, from the South to the North. According to the author, nonetheless, there is no quick and easy response to African dilemmas. Experiencing these decolonial processes in an organized and long-term path, was the only way to create the counter-powers necessary for Africa to overcome sustainably its condition of structural social subordination (Mazrui, 2010: 93).

The tendencies presented by the different African social thinkers are not convergent, but some of their issues and approaches intersect in practice. A radical continentalist pan-Africanist, such as Diop or N'Krumah, can agree with many aspects of the theories of others, such as Dia, Ki-Zerbo, Amin, Nyerere

<sup>19</sup> A view close to that of Ki-Zerbo was advocated, although in a different way, by a number of African intellectuals and politicians, such as Amadou Hampaté Bâ, Boubou Hama, Bassey Andah, Nnimmo Bassey, and many others. What unites them, beyond their ideological and chronological differences, is their distrust on knowledge types and proposals that ignore African historical and cultural realities. Indeed, the more urban and cosmopolitan Africa becomes, the more this argument would tend to lose strength. However, for contemporary authors who follow this stream of reasoning, such as Paul Houtundji, this fact is not insurmountable, since Africans in general, and governments in particular, seek to follow "more African" conduct; namely, looking for African solutions to African issues in the most varied fields of social life.

or Mazrui. What unites them, and for this reason they are highlighted here (among many others) is that such intellectuals / politicians never had a naive understanding of what African development was, in the sense that they knew it could not be conquered through the application of Western technical formulae as the theories of modernization of the 1940s and 1950s proposed. On the contrary, they have always sought alternative concepts and practices: “African unity”, “self-development”, “self-reliance”, “African socialism”, “disconnection”, “endogenous development”, “economic decolonization”. And if such proposals were not attempted (or not carried out satisfactorily) this does not mean that they were flawed or utopian. Actually, they emerge from the political struggles playing out in the development dynamics, as in any other part of the world – just then and also nowadays, as it is argued in the next section.

#### 4. RECONCILING LATIN AMERICAN AND AFRICAN THOUGHTS TO NEW CENTER/PERIPHERY RELATIONS

“The challenge thus consists of reconciling the interdependence implied by globalization and the inequalities of power of the social partners (workers in different sectors of the economy, some more competitive than others) and the national partners (dominant centers, middle powers, industrialized peripheries, the marginalized Fourth world) in relation to global capital. Let us start with some self-evident banalities: the world is both unified and diverse. But diversity is not exclusively, or even principally, cultural. Emphasis on cultural differences relegates the major differences of position in the economic hierarchy of world capitalism to secondary importance. But it is at the level of the later that we must begin the attack on the problem. (...) escape from global colonialism and liberal myths implies the rejection of neofascist illusions. These principles form the point of departure for meaningful reflection on the construction of a counter-project which is humanist, universalist, democratic and respectful of diversities, not inequalities. (Amin, 2006: 106).

The crisis during the 1980s has put in check the developmentalist rehearsal based on the tripod industrialization, protectionism and state interventionism. Taking further advantage of the social and environmental critiques on the development process, the ground was prepared by the central nations for the emergence of a new liberalizing wave, which would suggest, in terms of development strategy, the exact opposite of developmentalist practice: adaptation to the theory of comparative advantages, free trade and State minimization.

In parallel, huge changes in the World System were reshaping power and wealth relations among nations, such as deregulation and financial openness processes, productive and capital globalization, the strengthening of the international monetary standard based on the US dollar without ballast, the US military supremacy and the collapse of the Soviet Union, as well as innovations in the field of information technology. From the economic perspective, patterns of trade, production, and finance went through profound transformations, following new financial, management and business trends. The progressive



fragmentation of the productive chains of transnational corporations (TNCs) from advanced countries to underdeveloped countries involved the transfer of a series of activities and tasks - not only at productive stages. Hence, from the perspective of production, the traditional division between center-periphery, in which the periphery was producing primary goods, and the center manufactured goods, became no longer valid.

Therefore, to build a critical interpretation of development, and dependency, the international capitalist system has to be understood in depth, distinguishing the dynamics of the actual center-periphery relations in the 21st century. The international configuration of power and wealth in the 2000s and 2010s is based in what the development literature from the center have been calling global value chains (GVC, launched by the Global Value Chain Initiative). The production is internationally fragmented in value chains, that:

“(...) describes the full range of activities that firms and workers perform to bring a product from its conception to end use and beyond. This includes activities such as research and development (R&D), design, production, marketing, distribution and support to the final consumer. The activities that comprise a value chain can be contained within a single firm or divided among different firms” (Gereffi & Stark, 2016: 7).

Only a few developing countries have increased their weights at the international production, gaining market share and upgrading<sup>20</sup> in value chains - remarkably China, so that the countries in the center and in the periphery remained almost the same, actually with a wider gap in terms of income and life standards between Global South and North. Moreover, globalisation of value chains has deepened the inequalities in many senses (Moyo & Yeros, 2012), not only failing in enabling the Southern economies to catch-up in relation to North's, but increasing domestic disparities in terms of personal, functional, spatial, racial and gender incomes (Alvaredo *et al*, 2018)

Thus, the deepening in globalization of value chains have complicated the definition of roles in the international division of labour, but still there is a Center-periphery division. The generalization of industrial production globally transformed the established dichotomy manufacturing center/periphery natural resources producer, according to Prebisch and Dia - since the periphery also produces and exports manufactured products, and the center also produces and exports natural resources – as shows data on international trade (WTO). Actually, the center seems to be producing technology and knowledge-intensive complex goods (see Atlas of Complexity), or, particularly, the high value-added activities of GVC – as argue Cardoso & Reis (2018). In this sense, the center/ periphery division presented by Prebisch and Dia remains,

20 The notion of upgrading is crucial in the debate of GVC, and far from been consensual. By the moment, it can be simplified as economic and social improvement of the activities and tasks performed by companies and countries, moving from low-value to relatively high-value activities that leverage both material conditions of work and the quantity and quality of jobs created (Gereffi, 2005; Barrientos *et al*, 2011).

however, remodeled. There is still a significant difference in income between rich countries and others, which coincides with differences in the pattern of export and is also marked by structural heterogeneity, with the differentials of productivity in tradable and non-tradable sectors, especially of agricultural products (Cardoso & Reis, 2018).

However, upgrading in GVC (as it was the production of manufactured goods in the center periphery division of the post war period) is not directly related to the economic positive dynamics that rises productivity and wages, because many features may prevent the linkage effects (such as the macroeconomic regime, the abundance of labour force and its reduced power of bargain, the concentration of production means' property and of markets – as suggested by the Southern thoughts on development). Even worse, the development path suggested by the insertion in GVC may not be of interest to the Southern societies, as its view of progress and well-being may be quite different from the Eurocentric view. So, considering this current international division of labour framed by GVC, it persists the questions on what is and how to develop.

As it was shown in sections 1 and 2, alternative views historically emerged from the South and should be considered to answer them. In the light of African and Latin-American thoughts, it can be found important sociological and political absences of the mainstream Development perspectives: largely Eurocentric and economistic, they exclude some social Southern groups that are ultimately the majority of the population in the world. The concept of dependency between national and regional societies and economies and the world economy (Dos Santos, 2015) can still be relevant in the broad sense of its “unquietness” (*inquiétudes*).

That inquietness is not only the identification of a center and periphery system which are part of one same dynamic regarding the functioning of the World-System, defined by Wallerstein (2004): a spatial / temporal zone that cuts many political and cultural units and follows certain systemic rules. The hyphen serves as a reminder that the terms do not refer to the systems, economies, and empires of the world, but rather to systems, economies, and empires that are the world. This world tends to be organized by hegemonic cycles in which the most powerful economy and a small group of rich countries are the main origin of the big financial and non-financial TNCs and military armies that generate the technological paradigms and capital leading the international production and trade, organized in GVC. For the periphery states to grow in this scenario, the neoliberal recipe from the North have been not new in International Political Economy: free markets, strong institutions to protect property rights, specialization in comparative advantages, non-interventionist state. As mentioned before, this view was strongly criticized in Latin America and Africa since the post-war period, for example by Prebisch, Diop, Dia and Adedeji, who defended State-led industrialization and de-colonization based in the structural change of the trade and productive structures.

Upgrading in global value chains for socio-economic development, thus, would mean the promotion of structural changes towards the reduction of



productivity heterogeneity between tradable and non-tradable sectors, a key mechanism to change the underdevelopment condition emphasized by Furtado and Mazrui. Both were unquiet regarding the agro-exports growth model, but meanwhile Furtado, Tavares and other developmentalists from Latin America were more concerned about the macroeconomic reasoning of the dynamics, especially in what regards the balance of payments' constraints, Mazrui and Ki-Zerbo were proposing structural change in accordance to the African endogenous development and self-reliance, creating economic opportunities based on cultural and materio-spacial conditions that make sense for the strengthening of communities.

But the essential problem of these proposals, as the dependency theorists would argue, is that the national elites do not want to change their privileges crystallized in the actual economic and social structure. For them, the racial, gender, spatial inequalities are convenient, so that they are interested in national growth models associated to the logics of center-periphery World system. Dependency, colonialism, slavery are not only material relations of domination, but also ideological and psychologic subjective<sup>21</sup> dominative structures –which the Southern thoughts from Latin America and Africa fought against, from softer and reformist positions like Prebisch and Adedeji's ideas, to revolutionary ones, of the Latin American and African socialists Dos Santos, Bambirra, Marini, Gunder Frank, Dia, Amin. More recently, Quijano and Dussel in Latin America have shown the intimate link between the “historical-structural dependence”, the “coloniality of power” and the “hegemony of Eurocentrism as a perspective of knowledge” that despite located in different theoretical and ontological planes, remain configuring a general mesh of historical domination (Polo Blanco, 2018: 121).

In sum, changing social and State priorities need, first, social/ institutional ruptures in which the (neo) associate dependency, colonialist and other conservative interests from the national elites that represent foreign interests shall be replaced by popular ideals. However, this fundamental transformation seems even more difficult for the periphery in the current actual historic moment than in the post war period, once the Southern societies and States are losing power and material means to resist and transform its subordinated position in the World-System (Hadler, 2012). TNC's power on governing and structuring the international division of labour has increased, meanwhile

21 “[H]emos querido mostrar que la maquinaria colonial no fue únicamente un entramado político, económico y militar dedicado a la brutal extracción de recursos naturales mediante los métodos expeditivos de la esclavitud y la explotación. Transcurridos los siglos, la dominación neocolonial tampoco se limita a ser una relación asimétrica de las relaciones comerciales internacionales o la expresión de una posición dependiente dentro de la división internacional del trabajo. Desde luego, también es eso. Y en ese plano, la intervención crítica de la teoría de la dependencia fue (y es) de un valor impagable. Pero como hemos querido mostrar a lo largo de estas páginas, la dominación neocolonial también se fraguó en la construcción de subjetividades y mentalidades, en el aquilatamiento de discursos e imaginarios. Y es ahí donde la crítica poscolonial, el giro decolonial y en definitiva la perspectiva de la colonialidad aparecen como imprescindibles” (Polo Blanco, 2018: 121).

the political and cultural fragmentation in Latin American and Africa are weakening democracy and strengthening conservative interests in the States. The Global South unification in the 2000s, in a large extent led by the big emerging economies of BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa), was weakened after political and economic difficulties that most of them, except China, are suffering. In the meanwhile, the Global North countries are struggling with their own internal class hatred resulted from neo-Nazism and other sort of attacks to human rights and social achievements.

Once again, the continentalist idea of Diop or Nkrumah rises as a fortunate solution that could help to keep peace and promote development, in the Southern sense of co-joint evolution of material, political and social conditions in respect to cultural humanist and communal priorities. Overall, the intellectuals' works revised in this paper are united in essence by the deny of Western technical formulae and theories of modernization (a need claimed also by Oluwole, 1997). Following the view of most - if not all - of them, the peripheral integration into what today we call World-System of GVC would have to prioritize the regional strategy, taking care of its historical challenges that prevented both Latin America and Africa to achieve regionalization in the depth of its original concepts (reviewed in sections 1 and 2). Regionalization is a political project, that can be driven by social-cultural-environmental ideals, such as the pan-African vision for the unity of the African continent. But this depends, once again, on the change in the interests that control the State towards popular aspirations for better living standards and reduction of inequalities.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS: DEVELOPMENT IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

South's thoughts and historical experiences from Latin America and Africa have suggested that the relationship between industrialization and development is not so straightforward. Nowadays the industrial strategy could be reviewed with a strategy of sophistication (upgrading) – a term preferred in contemporary discourse and industrial, technology and innovation. Productive and commercial sophistication could lead to a dynamic that would absorb the most prevalent factor, i.e., abundant labour, so increasing productivity and real remuneration to an equal standing in both the exporting and non-exporting sectors, ultimately promoting income redistribution. However, this linkage is not natural; it is neither inherent in the market, nor is it guaranteed through state intervention since it is permeated by conflicts and disputes. Development and distribution depend on a joint change in structure and institutions, transcending internal and external political and economic interests - rarely, if ever, proven in the postwar period (with the only possible exceptions being Japan and South Korea) - to the point of effectively transforming a peripheral nation into a centralized one.

For this reason, it is necessary to consider the historical lessons regarding the position of State in the developmentalist period, since its success



in terms of development and distribution depended on at least three important considerations (Pempel, 1999). The first is that the correlation of forces in society, generally unequal and dominated by a minority of class interests, culminates in a political composition of the state apparatus that in developmentalism gives considerable prominence to its bureaucracy and its political project for a development strategy that might be not really national, nor worried to correspond to local people and community's values, culture and knowledge. The second consideration is that there are alternative trajectories of development, and there are more options for economic activities that generate employment (and even upgrading) than just dependent, or modernizing, pathways. Finally, the third point is that development must face market forces and international geopolitics. In the long run, the national and regional strategies are sustainable as embark on a project of legitimacy and generate positive results for the national society as a whole, and for a continental region that is united, integrated and federalized, in order to face the challenges of the 21st century inter-state capitalist system.<sup>22</sup>

As suggested by the African thinking presented in our survey, the context of the periphery, historically constituted as export enclaves, and undergoing industrialization to varying degrees, development means challenging the system of exploitation based on racism, violence and the structural marginalization within the society. In addition to uniting the interests of the public and private sectors in the formation of an industrialized nation, in which the state would have a strong participation in the economy, and promote its modernization – as proposed by the Latin and African developmentalist, the difficulties would lie within the political crises derived from this process. Expanding on the pan-Africanist ideal (liberation, integration, solidarity and African personality), which to some extent also recalls the defense of the profound integration proposed by Latin American structuralists since Prebisch, a regional vision should follow the post-national continentalist ideal. As it was argued, the achievement of development from the south perspective is not within the reach of any African or Latin American nation in particular - not even Brazil - given the hegemonic hierarchy of the inter-State system. Thus, from the economic and geopolitical point of view, nations should strength South-South trade and, taking a step forward in the direction of Dia's proposal, even promote communal alternatives ("African Socialism"). In this sense, a political project with Ujamaa-like conditions and material life style would be an alternative ecofriendly pathway concomitant to industrial urbanization, on the road towards rural community "self-reliance".

Alternatively - and more radically – there are still the proposals put forward by Amin's concepts of "endogenous development" or "economic

22 Therefore, the State has many issues to address, what depends of its political composition. After all is not merely the vague concept that it appears to be in theoretical formulations. The problem of the developmentalist state in the postwar is that it was an idealized ideological construction, transformed by theory into a logical deduction or a simple epistemological entity required by the industrialization strategy, without analyzing the nature of the coalitions of power on which it is based (Fiori, 1999).

decolonization”, since for him the bourgeois projects - developmentalism, populism, Bandung – would sooner or later fail, inasmuch as they would not represent the true interests of the underclasses, and indeed have never led to a significant redistribution of income on the periphery. In any case, one of the great contributions of African ideas on development is precisely the awareness that it should not be a process of application of economic formulae and western technician’s policies. That is, it should not come from a Eurocentric perspective (like Santos (2006) argue, too), but, on the contrary, from its own direction (via “African unity”, “self-development”, “self-reliance”, “African socialism”, “disconnection”, “endogenous development”, “economic decolonization”). Thus, African and Latin American unquietness concerning autonomy with regard to development strategies reaffirms the initial position of the present article, i.e., that development is a concept under construction. Any attempt to imprison it in a universal, timeless, and detached definition of its historical, social, and cultural reality - a perspective from which strategies are derived for their own sake – could, essentially, disconnect it from its own purpose.

#### REFERENCES

- Adedeji, A. (2010): “Comparative strategies of economic decolonization in Africa”. In: Mazrui, A. (Ed.). *Africa since 1935*. UNESCO General History of Africa, vol. VIII, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Adebajo, A. (2014): “Two prophets of regional integration: Prebisch and Adedeji”. In: *International Development: Ideas, Experience, and Prospects*, Oxford University Press online.
- Alvaredo, F.; Chancel; L.; Piketty, T.; Saez, E.; and Zucman; G. (2017): *World inequality report 2018*. Paris: World Inequality Lab.
- Amin, S. (2006): *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization. The Management of Contemporary Society*. Zed Books, London.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1994): *Re-reading the post war period*. Monthly Review Press, New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1973): *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*, Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Arndt, H. W. (1987): *Economic Development - the History of an Idea*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Arrighi, G. (1994): *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. New York: Verso.
- Bagchi, A. K. (1976): “La desindustrialización de la India en el siglo XIX y sus implicaciones teóricas”. *Journal of Development Studies*, v. 12, issue 2, pp. 135- 164.
- Baldwin, R. (2008): *The Development and Testing of Heckscher–Ohlin Trade Models*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA .
- Bambirra, V. (1972): *El capitalismo dependiente latinoamericano*. Prensa Latinoamericana, Santiago do Chile.



- Baran, P.; and Sweezy, P. (1966): *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Barrientos, S.; Gereffi, G.; and Rossi, A. (2011): "Economic and Social Upgrading in Global Production Networks: A New Paradigm for a Changing World". *International Labour Review*, n. 150(3-4), pp. 319-40.
- Bielschowsky, R. (2016): *ECLAC Thinking, Selected Texts (1948-1998)*. Santiago, ECLAC, United Nations.
- Blomstrom, M.; and Hettne, B. (1992): *Las teorías del desarrollo en transición*. México City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bodenheimer, S. (1970): "Dependency and Imperialism". *Politics and Society*, n.5, May.
- Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2011): "From the National-Bourgeoisie to the Dependency Interpretation of Latin America". *Latin American Perspectives*, Issue 178, v. 38, n. 3, pp. 40-58.
- Cardoso, F. H., and Faletto, E. (1979): *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1969.
- Cardoso, F. G.; and Reis, C. F. B. (2018): "Centro e periferia nas cadeias globais de valor: uma interpretação a partir dos pioneiros do desenvolvimento". *Revista de Economia Contemporânea*, v.22, n. 3.
- Carrete, E. (2014): "The dependency theory and development: a historical view". In Cardoso, J. L.; Marcuzzo, Ma. C.; Sotelo, M. E. (orgs.) *Economic Development and Global Crisis: The Latin American Economy in Historical Perspective*. Routledge: London.
- Chang, H. J. (2002): *Kicking away the ladder: development strategy in historical perspective: policies and institutions for economic development in historical perspective*. Anthem Press, London.
- Dêves-Valdês, E. (2008): *O pensamento sul-saariano: conexões e paralelos com o pensamento latino-americano e o asiático*. CLACSO-EDUCAM, São Paulo.
- Dia, M. (1969): *Réflexions sur l'économie de l'Afrique noire*. Éditions africaines, Paris.
- Diop, C. A. (1955): "Alerte sous les tropiques". *Presence Africaine*, n. 5, pp. 8-33.
- Dos Santos, T. (1970): "The structure of dependence". *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 60, No. 2, Papers and Proceedings of the Eighty-second Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association (May, 1970), pp. 231- 236.
- \_\_\_\_\_, (2015): *A Teoria da Dependência: Balanço e Perspectivas*. Rio de Janeiro: Insular.
- Dosman, E. (2008): *The life and times of Raúl Prebisch, 1901-1986*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.
- Emmanuel, A. (1973): *A Troca Desigual*, v.1. Estampa, Lisboa.
- Fiori, J. L. (1999): "De volta à questão da riqueza de algumas nações". In Fiori, J. L. (Ed.), *Estados e moedas no desenvolvimento das nações*. Editora Vozes, Petrópolis.

- Furtado, C. (1962): *Desenvolvimento e Subdesenvolvimento*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Fundo de Cultura.
- Gereffi, G.; and Fernandez-Stark, K. (2016): *Global value chain analysis: a primer*. Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness, Duke University, 2a edition, 2016.
- Gereffi, G.; Humphrey, J.; and Sturgeon, T. (2005): "The governance of global value chains". *Review of international political economy*, n. 12.1, pp.78-104.
- Girvan, N. (1973): "The Development of Dependency Economics in the Caribbean and Latin America: Review and Comparison", *Social and Economic Studies*, XXII, March.
- Global Value Chain Initiative. Duke University. Available at, last accessed in April 2018: <https://globalvaluechains.org/about-us>
- Green, R. H.; and Seidman, A. (1968) *Unity or Poverty: The Economics of Pan-Africanism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Gunder Frank, A. (1991): "Latin American Development Theories Revisited: A Participant Review". *Latin American Perspectives*, v. 19, pp. 125-139.
- Hadler, J. P. (2012): "A teoria da dependência na etapa superior do imperialismo: novos desafios práticos e teóricos para a revolução latino-americana". In *Anais do VII Colóquio Internacional Marx-Engels*, Campinas, 24-27th July.
- Kalecki, M. (2013): *Theory of economic dynamics*. Routledge, v. 6, London, 1954.
- Ki-Zerbo, J. (1962): "The negro-African personality". *Présence Africaine*, n. 41, v. 13, pp. 137-143.
- Marini, R. M. (1972): "Dialectica de la dependencia: la economia exportadora". *Sociedad y Desarrollo*, n. 1, pp. 5-31.
- Mazrui, A. (2010): "Conclusion". In: Mazrui, A. (Ed.). *Africa since 1935*. UNESCO General History of Africa, vol. VIII, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Medeiros, C. A. (2008). Os dilemas da integração sul-americana. *Cadernos do Desenvolvimento*, n. 3(5), pp. 213-254.
- Medeiros, C. A. (2013): "Estratégias Nacionais de Desenvolvimento". In Bielschowski (ed.) *Padrões de Desenvolvimento econômico (1050-2008)*. IPEA, v. 2, Brasília.
- Moyo, S.; and Yeros, P. (2013): "The Classical Agrarian Question: Myth, Reality and Relevance Today." *Agrarian South Journal of Political Economy*, n. 2 (1), pp. 93 – 119.
- Ngo Man Lan, (1984): *Unreal Growth, Critical Studies in Asian Development*. Hindustan Publishing Corporation, Delhi, 2 vols.
- Nkrumah, Kwame (1965) *Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd.
- NOBEL PRIZE. The Nobel Prize 2004: Wangari Muta Maathai. *Biographical*. Available in: <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2004/maathai/biographical/>
- OCDE/OMC. (2013): *Interconnected economies: benefiting from global value chains*. Preliminary Version. Geneva.



- Oluwole, S. (1997): "Culture, Gender, and Development Theories in Africa". *Africa Development / Afrique Et Développement*, n. 22(1), pp. 95-121.
- Palma, G. (1978): Dependency: A formal theory of underdevelopment or a methodology for the analysis of concrete situations of underdevelopment? *World Development*, v. 6, pp. 881-924.
- Pempel, T. J. (1999): "The developmental regime in a changing world economy". In Woo-Cumings, M. (ed.) *The Developmental State*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Pinto, S. R. (2012): O pensamento social e político Latino-Americano: etapas de seu desenvolvimento. *Sociedade e Estado*, n.27(2), pp. 337-359.
- Prebisch, R. (1963): "O desenvolvimento econômico latino-americano e alguns de seus principais problemas". In Bielschowsky, R. (Ed.), *Cinquenta anos de pensamento da CEPAL*. Record, v. 1, Rio de Janeiro.
- Polo Blanco, J. (2018): "Colonialidad múltiple en América Latina: Estructuras de dependencia, relatos de subalternidad". *Latin American Research Review*. 53(1), pp.111–125.
- Quijano, A. (1998): La colonialidad del poder y la experiencia cultural latinoamericana". In Briceño-León, R. & Sontag, H. *Pueblo, época y desarrollo: La sociología de América Latina*. Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela, Editorial Nueva Sociedad, CENDES.
- Santos, M. (2006): "Por uma epistemologia existencial". In: Lemos, A; Silveira, M.; Arroyo, M (orgs.) *Questões territoriais na América Latina*. CLACSO, São Paulo.
- Sen, A. (1999): *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Sunkel, O. (1967): "Política nacional de desarrollo y dependencia externa" *Revista de Estudios Internacionales*, v. I, n. 1, May.
- Tavares, M. C. (1972): *Da substituição de importações ao capitalismo financeiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- UNCTAD (2013): *World Investment Report*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Genève.
- Wallerstein, I. (2004): *World System Analysis*. London: Duke University Press.

