H. Watson

Economic dependency and geopolitics: recurring ideological themes in Caribbean intellectual culture

In: New West Indian Guide/ Nieuwe West-Indische Gids 60 (1986), no: 3/4, Leiden, 223-238

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

ECONOMIC DEPENDENCY AND GEOPOLITICS:
RECURRING IDEOLOGICAL THEMES IN CARIBBEAN
INTELLECTUAL CULTURE

Dependency under challenge: the political economy of the Commonwealth Caribbean. ANTHONY PAYNE & PAUL SUTTON (eds.). Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984. xii + 295 pp. (Cloth £ 25.)

Colossus challenged: the struggle for Caribbean influence. H. MICHAEL ERISMAN & JOHN D. MARTZ (eds.). Boulder CO.: Westview Press, 1982. x + 260 pp. (Cloth US\$ 19.50)

The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development. PAGET HENRY & CARL STONE (eds.). Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues (ISHI), Inter-American Politics Series, Volume 4, 1983. xxx + 348 pp. (Paper US\$ 12.95)

Geopolitics of the Caribbean: mini-states in a wider world. THOMAS D. ANDERSON. New York: Praeger Publishers, Politics in Latin America, a Hoover Institution Series co-published with Hoover Institution Press, 1984. xii + 175 pp. (Cloth US\$ 26.95)

There are thirty-six essays and almost as many contributors to these volumes. The themes cover the geopolitics of mini-states within the U.S. domain (Anderson 1984); the search for influence in the face of the North American "colossus" (Erisman and Martz 1982); the successes and failures of Commonwealth Caribbean "states" in their "challenge of dependency" (Payne and Sutton 1984); and the implications of decolonization for democratization and development (Henry and Stone 1983).

To what extent do these essays reveal a clear understanding of capitalism as practised in the Caribbean and in the wider world? In other words, do these studies take us beyond ideological consciousness?

I

The appearance of Paul Baran's *The political economy of growth* (1957) corresponded with the upsurge in Third World decolonization and independence movements. Since that time, major contributions have been made to the study of Third World political economy and international relations. Dependency analysis has been integrated into studies on the role of small states in the global system. Frank (1972), Oxaal, Barnett and Booth (1975), Taylor (1979) and Bodenheimer (1972) have directed Third World intellectual culture beyond the ideology of the "sociology of development." Dependency/underdevelopment analyses and World Systems theory are the bedrock of radical and neo-Marxist political economy – which must be distinguished from the Critique of Political Economy of Marx. What is the intellectual status of Caribbean dependency analysis?

Oxaal (1975: 32–45) argues that Commonwealth Caribbean dependency analysis adopts an ideology of "economic nationalism" in its debate over Caribbean development problems, priorities and possibilities. Payne (1984: 4–7) suggests that the New World Group,¹ under whose auspices Caribbean dependency analysis emerged, was predominantly radical, nationalist, populist and anti-Marxist in outlook. Unlike Latin America with its rich legacy of Trotskyist, socialist and communist political and intellectual tendencies that were also rooted in the working class movements, the Commonwealth Caribbean possessed no such intellectual, political and working class traditions. On the contrary, the dominant radical ideas were received from the left-wing norms of the Fabian social democratic principles of the British Labour Party.

By the start of the decolonization process the more developed Marxist and socialist minority elements had been purged from (or neutralized within) the dominant political parties and trade union movement (Jagan 1967; Munroe 1981; Watson 1975; Radosh 1969). The expansion of American power and capital in the region after World War II and the use of the Central Intelligence Agency's connections within organized labor in the U.S. and the International Confede-

ration of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) accelerated this process of neutralization, expulsion and cooptation of the left. Therefore, Caribbean dependency analysis which borrowed directly from nationalist and structuralist traditions in Latin America (ECLA, [Furtado, Sunkel *et al.*]), grew up in an environment that was bereft of a Marxist revolutionary intellectual, and revolutionary democratic political, tradition. Demas (1965) was one such classic example in the ECLA structuralist tradition. By the end of the 1960's and into the early 1970's, the limits of import-substitution accumulation strategies were being reached in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana. Social ferment began to grow and the intellectuals, the workers and the petty bourgeois regimes began to register their disappointment with import substitution.

By that time, the "New World" studies had already started. Lewis'² neo-Ricardian model and accompanying recommendations received the brunt of the New World nationalist criticism. (The attack on Lewis' work was much more an ideological than a scientific critique.³ Both Lewis and his critics failed to realize that the international requirements of modern capitalism can no longer process backward capitalism, as was the case in the 18th and 19th centuries [Watson 1986]). The New World Group's reply to Demas (1965) came from Best (1971), "Size and Survival" and his (1971) "Independent Thought and Freedom in the Caribbean," and Jefferson (1972) and others. These were classic "New Left" arguments eschewing industrialism, and seeming to uphold the petty bourgeois notion that "small is beautiful."

There is no doubt that the New World Group produced relevant and vivid descriptions of the self-evident economic problems facing the Caribbean. *Readings in the political economy of the Caribbean* edited by Girvan and Jefferson (1971) – with major arguments by Alister McIntyre, Lloyd Best, Norman Girvan, Owen Jefferson, Havelock Brewster and George Beckford, among others – is one such case. In this work, McIntyre defines both "structural and functional dependence" (pp. 165–183). Later Brewster (1973) defined economic dependence as a lack of sectoral interdependence. Girvan (1972, 1978) and Beckford (1972) produced some of the most comprehensive radical, nationalist (dependency) statements on the connection between monopoly capital and underdevelopment, in which they drew eclectically from the nationalist and neo-Marxist traditions in Latin America. Girvan (1973) made the connection between the development of dependency economies in Latin America and the Caribbean. His conceptions may have been further radicalized as a result of his sojourn with Samir Amin at UNDP in Dakar, Senegal.

A handful of Commonwealth Caribbean scholars adopted a more overt revolutionary intellectual orientation and became increasingly politically involved in the early 1970s, e.g. the late Walter Rodney (1972, 1975), Clive Thomas (1974), and Trevor Munroe (1972) – but their work had also been marked by its dependency/underdevelopment orientation. The transition of the Peoples Progressive Party (PPP) in Guyana to Marxist-Leninist status by the end of the 1960s, the formation of the Working People's Alliance (WPA) in Guyana, and the development of the Workers Liberation League (WWL) and its successor the Workers Party of Jamaica (1974), were responses to the crisis in the region. The so-called "Rodney Riots" in Jamaica in the late 1960s, the Trinidad Rebellion in 1970, and the revolutionary nationalist and democratic "Black Power Movement" throughout the Caribbean were among the main political indications of systemic crisis. The authoritarian and at times radical state capitalist response to these crises (Stone 1983: 37–63; Thomas 1984: 89–104; Sutton 1984: 43–76), found "New World" and Caribbean dependency theory unable to provide a penetrating analysis. At that time the New World Group basically disintegrated over the question of the Group's political direction.⁴

Reviews of other developments in Caribbean intellectual life (e.g. Brown and Brewster (1974) Greene (1974)), neither transcend prevailing paradigms nor aspire to the status of "critique" in the Kantian or Marxian sense. The problem of small state participation in the global system has been conceptualized in terms of the structural constraints derived from size (geography, population, resource base, technical and administrative capabilities) and the monopolization of power by hegemonic "powers." Lewis (1976, 1983, 1984), Ashley (1983), Benn (1984), Ramsaran (1984) and others have detailed the nature and role of these constraints from a geopolitics-of-dependency perspective that draws in varying degree from economic dependency analysis. Emphasis is placed on openness (dependence on foreign capital, foreign trade, foreign aid, and technical assistance), absence of sectoral integration and interdependence, inability to manage and manipulate economic mechanisms of transformation, and monoculture (oil, plantations, bauxite, tourism, etc.). International relations studies add to this list administrative and bureaucratic dependency in foreign policy formulation and execution, client-state status, inability to chart and pursue independent foreign policies due to leverage that is occasioned by dependence on foreign capital, aid, etc., the national interests of hegemonic powers that limit the options of regimes, and the policy choices

and options that are left open to prudent states. To what extent do the essays under review reflect or transcend the self-consciousness of these past fifteen years?

II

Because economic dependency and geopolitical analysis root their theories in notions of external economic and political domination, they generate liberal, radical and revolutionary conceptions of anti-imperialist reaction. The ideological tenor of the reaction varies with the outlook and theoretical sophistication of the individual. Some of the writers under review examine the role of domestic factors in the reproduction of dependency: for example, (1) the degree of submissiveness or collaboration between local political and economic elites and foreign capital and imperialism (Farrell 1983); (2) the extent to which local capitalists maintain "inappropriate" specializations and manifest inertia in terms of failing to develop the economy (Ashley 1983); (3) the failure to make imperialism respect sovereignty and ideological pluralism (Erisman 1982; Will 1982); (4) the inability to acquire and sustain power in the international system (Lewis 1983, 1984); and (5) the success or failure of regimes to maintain political democracy and thereby keep the communists and Cubans at bay which leads Anderson (1984: 119–124) to classify democracy as a geopolitical variable.

For Anderson, and more so the contributors to Henry and Stone (1983) which stresses the interrelationship between decolonization, democratization and development, the issues of dependency and geopolitical subordination undermine the ability of Caribbean regimes to develop and maintain democratic systems. A major difference between Anderson's conception of democracy and those found in the Henry and Stone volume is that the former derives more or less exclusively from American democratic thought (i.e. political democracy) while the latter tends to see a dialectical interrelationship between the economic and political components of democracy. The essays on Trinidad and Tobago (Parris), Antigua (Richards and Henry), Guyana (Danns and Greene), Jamaica (Stone), Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic (Martinez) and the policy perspective by Horowitz, emphasize this to one degree or another. Yet, Anderson asserts that politics cannot be separated from economic development and social welfare, and contends that access to credit is a significant geopolitical element in the Third World (p. 129).

Dependency, from Anderson's perspective, is a fact of life in the Caribbean. From his positivistic perspective, the U.S. and the Caribbean share an interdependent existence which makes it prudent for the mini-states to respect American national security interests and for the U.S. to provide capital, aid and military support to make democracy viable in the area. Like Stone's second essay on Jamaica (in which he criticizes the Manley regime for confusing popular support for welfare programs with mass support for anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism), Anderson argues that Marxism-Leninism has its major following among the small number of intellectuals in the university, with little or none among the workers and peasants. Others, like Henry and Richards, emphasize the deepening chasm between the "political elite" and the "masses" while the ties between the local political and economic elite and imperialism grow much stronger. They have not necessarily seen this as a congruence of mutual class interests.

Contributions to Erisman and Martz (1982) clearly stress geopolitical issues and perspectives. Erisman et al. contend that the major reaction to American hegemony by Cuba, Grenada, Jamaica, and the Caribbean Basin middle powers proves that, "a colossus challenged is a colossus no more." This notion fits in well with the title of the study. Valenta and Duncan, whose essays dealt with Soviet responses to the Caribbean crisis and Cuba's search for influence in Central America and the Caribbean, follow the traditional geopolitical conception: the Soviet and Cuban alliance represents a threat to American national security interests in the region. By extension, the deepening of this alliance in Central America and the Caribbean represents a greater threat. Martz and Williams analyze the geopolitics of oil in Venezuela and Mexico's Caribbean Basin policies as examples of the struggle for influence by "middle powers."

Unanalyzed in these studies is the crucial fact that these so-called middle powers have been forced to find new markets and allies to counter the stranglehold of U.S. imperialism over their economies. This connection is made in a much more critical way in Maira's essay in Henry and Stone. Lewis raises the geopolitical issues in both Payne and Sutton (1984) and in Henry and Stone (1983). One of the major points he makes is that the attempts by middle status powers to develop some degree of autonomy from the U.S. would itself be a destabilizing factor for U.S. security interests. Attempts by Mexico and Venezuela to promote a peaceful settlement in Central America through the CONTADORA group have been systematically undermined by Washington which would prefer that all these countries mobilize behind

Washington as was almost the case in the 1965 invasion of the Dominican Republic. But the world capitalist crisis and market contraction dictate that Mexico and Venezuela develop new markets in the region. Finally, Marvin Will's analysis of the Commonwealth Caribbean and Pearson's statements on Central American perspectives of big and middle powers strike a balance between conventional conceptions of economic dependency and geopolitics.

An important and unanswered question in the essays in Erisman and Martz (1982) is to what extent have the Caribbean Basin countries effectively challenged the "colossus" of the North? It is my contention that this question cannot be properly addressed by the ideology of economic and political dependency precisely because the fundamental changes in the world economic and political arena in the last fifteen years require a level of conceptualization and analysis that dependency theory cannot provide. It is not so much the macroanalytic scope and focus of Erisman and Martz that limits the work as it is the way that ideological considerations cloud the conceptual and methodological disposition of liberalism.

In some ways, Payne and Sutton (1984) complement Erisman and Martz (1982). The complementarity is low, however, because while the former conclude that the Caribbean is still "living with dependency," the latter assert that the very challenge of the colossus proves that the colossus is no more. Logically, one may be tempted to conclude that the search for influence represents an end to dependency or a significant diminution of its incidence. Neither is the case. Substantively, the essays in Payne and Sutton on Jamaica (Payne), Trinidad and Tobago (Sutton), Guyana (Thomas) and Grenada (Thomdike) are case studies that show how local regimes have dealt with the problems of capitalism and imperialism.

The conception of dependency under challenge at the territorial level means that these regimes did not face imperialism from a supine position. The essays do not attempt to systematically integrate the dependency theory framework that Payne provides in the Introduction. Dependency is accepted as a fact of life and the authors attempt to show how the regimes responded to it. Each country's specific responses are detailed and it is shown that fortuitous international and/or domestic developments were crucial in shaping these responses: (1) the weakened position of the U.S. in the early 1970's aided Manley's populist nationalist social democratic program (Payne) and this is corroborated somewhat by Stone in Henry and Stone; (2) OPEC oil price hikes after 1972 saved Trinidad which capitalized on PNM

parliamentary dominance to push through a nationalist industrialization strategy (Sutton); (3) absence of a strong rightist opposition in Guyana and considerable left wing mobilization gave Burnham's PNC a golden opportunity to implement a radical state capitalist program; (4) the difficulties and crisis of Grenada's New Jewel Movement Revolution reflected the period when it came and the changing regional and international forces at work.

The regional focus in the study by Payne, Axline, Ramsaran and Sutton is disappointing. They restate old, even if valid, arguments about the crisis of regional industrial and agricultural strategies, and Ramsaran's and Sutton's conclusions about CARICOM-U.S. and CARICOM-EEC relations also restate commonplace arguments. The real problem here is that none of these regional discussions managed to situate CARICOM in the international division of labor and analyze the potential of the state and local bourgeois interests to adopt competitive strategies for entering the world market. In fact, the crisis and failure of CARICOM help to explain the failures of the individual countries. One could add that CARICOM has not even done a creditable job at rationalizing the economy, bureaucracies and administrative services to accommodate foreign capital. The authors thoroughly ignore the role of insular petty bourgeois nationalism in the state and economic sectors in undermining this process. Further, the focus on imperialism with respect to the U.S. and the EEC ignores the crisis in the world economy and the restructuring requirements of monopoly capital.

Essays by Lewis and Benn restate the dependency and geopolitical concerns. Benn overstates the ideological significance of the NIEO proposals, but he never manages to explain why the implementation of NIEO economic proposals would find most Caribbean economies and markets unable to process the requirements of modern capitalism. Nor does he anticipate the chasm between apparently radical nationalism and anti-imperialism on issues such as nonalignment, apartheid and dominance by the MNC's on the one hand and automatic mobilization behind Reagan's CBI restructuring strategy. Again, the ideology of dependency and geopolitics leave much to be desired.

As already indicated, most of the essays in Henry and Stone suggest that authoritarianism has become an important state practice in the Caribbean. It is not clear, even in the very penetrating treatments by Stone and Lewis, that these practices reflect the changing political character and forms of rule of the state in the sense that Thomas (1984) and Watson (1984) have suggested. Manitzas' essay on Cuba offers a

most refreshing contrast to the highly ideological essays in Erisman and Martz on Cuba and the USSR. Among Manitzas' major strengths is that she clearly recognizes and explains that it is impossible for any Third World country to delink from U.S. imperialism and make it on its own. Thus, she provides a useful argument on the dialectical interrelationship between delinking and relinking. It is here that she demonstrates a qualitative change in Cuba's domestic and international "comportment," and avoids the ideological preoccupation and fixations of standard geopolitical (East-West) interpretations. Martinez, Henry, Greene and Danns conclude that dependency is at the root of the authoritarian tendencies in the societies they have studied. This is misleading. Parris' contribution clearly indicates that the Williams strategy was based on the premise that the industrialization program he had in mind for Trinidad and Tobago was not possible without foreign capital and a highly disciplined labor force. One major implication of this analysis is that authoritarian state practices are an integral part of Third World capitalist industrialization. This is also Horowitz's contention. This does not necessarily have to occur in this sequence because, as Thoumi's essay has shown in the case of Haiti, the local bourgeoisie may very well adopt strategies that are inimical to local industrialization. Thoumi did not anticipate the problems that Haiti currently poses for Reaganism: the difficulty of deepening Haiti's integration into the U.S. system in the post-Duvalier period without some degree of political and economic liberalization.

III

What is striking about the four volumes is that not one of them places the U.S. economy at, or near center stage of their analyses. None addresses the fundamental changes taking place in the world economy such as the restructuring of the international division of labor, and the acceleration of the redeployment of finance capital to offshore production sites in certain areas of the Third World. The CBI anticipates precisely these developments and requirements because it is a response to the crisis of U.S. monopoly capital. Restructuring requires imperialism to become active in the normal political processes of Third World countries. Third World mass demands for democratization based upon economic and political democracy and the populist-nationalist and revolutionary democratic norms that inform these demands cannot be readily countenanced by imperialism whether they are emerging in

Manila, Kingston, St. George's or Port-au-Prince. Authoritarian politics and states are necessary to process and contain these popular demands. This is one of the merits of most of the essays in Henry and Stone, but these ideas are at the subterranean level in that volume.

To transcend the ideological consciousness of the age demands a sense of history as a dialectical process, and such an historical consciousness must be able to reflect the meaning of the changes that are occurring before our very eyes. The old neocolonial mode of Third World incorporation has basically run its course. The international socialization of production deepens the division of labor, and the internationalization of capital demands the complete integration of the Caribbean Basin through the CBI into the American system.

On March 3, 1986, Irving Kristol, who effectively articulates high level conservative public opinion in the U.S., noted in the *Wall Street Journal* that the U.S. faces tough choices in dealing with its Third World client-states, many of which (like Jamaica, Grenada and Haiti) cannot even adequately process and utilize small amounts of foreign aid, much less large quantities of direct investment. Mr. Kristol laments their apparent inability to develop and manage basic infrastructure. Yet, they are plagued by revolutionary democratic and nationalist populist demands for democratization, etc. These demands reflect the unstable balance of class forces within and outside the state and threaten to undermine American strategic interests. The challenge of the "colossus," the "challenge of dependency" and the correlation between decolonization and authoritarian state forms are contradictory expressions of this process. It is no longer possible to restructure the U.S. economy or any single Caribbean economy as a viable national (autonomous) entity. Conventional notions of sovereignty become increasingly tenuous. None of this has become totally clear at the international level because of the failure of ideological consciousness to keep up with changes in the material processes and relations of production.

Nonetheless, it is clear in the U.S. that the state and finance capital have devised and implemented strategies to discipline labor: union busting, wage cuts and profit-sharing gimmicks are part of the strategy. Any rapid acceleration of the international movement of capital is bound to be destabilizing and will inevitably pose certain specific risks for U.S. capital, foreign markets, raw materials, etc., especially in the Third World. U.S. officials have publicly acknowledged that crisis and instability in Latin America and the Caribbean Basin areas produce direct and negative consequences for the U.S. economy and

employment. Reagan's militant anti-communist and militaristic foreign policy in the Caribbean Basin area are revealing. He finds the entire CONTADORA meddling to be an irritant. He is not simply interested in limiting Soviet competition as East-West geopolitical perceptions always suggest; it is a matter of life and death for the survival of U.S. capital. The labor-intensive stage of finance capital has already been exported to Third World production zones in East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean and the rate of profit depends on consolidating this process, as in textiles, electronics, computer chips, medical supplies and information services. East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean bear out this fact (Watson 1986).

What the nationalist ideology of economic dependency cannot reflect is this objective law-governed process of the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation. Exploitation, unemployment, uneven development, poverty, etc., in the Third World are all attributed to the excesses of foreign capital and represented as peculiar to the Third World; but nothing could be further from the truth. Dependency ideology clamours for localization while discrediting local capitalists and industrialism. Its hostility to local capital is premised upon the failure of the latter to develop the productive forces of industry and labor. Yet, such a program has little hope for success within the nationalist framework, the smallness of the resource base and markets, and the backwardness of the productive forces. Outside of a single CARICOM market, there is no real viability for the individual economies of the Eastern Caribbean, and the main drawback from all four volumes is that this simple fact is not grasped. In this sense, they remain profoundly ideological essays rooted in economic nationalism and geopolitics.

NOTES

1. New World Group was formed in 1962. Part of its rationale was to respond to the crisis that had gripped Guyana since the 1950's. Its origin also coincided with the year of independence in Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica. *New World Quarterly* was its intellectual outlet. The study, *Readings in the political economy of the Caribbean* edited by Girvan and Jefferson (1971) contains some of the main statements on dependency by leading members of the New World Group.

2. Sir Arthur Lewis was associated with the Fabian Society in London during the 1930's and 1940's. He opposed the application of open laissez-faire economic policies in the colonies because he was convinced that such policies would hamper industrialization because the local capitalists were not favorably disposed to the development of modern industry. See Lewis 1950: 34-35.

3. Lewis' model was not an import-substitution industrialization (ISI) model per se. In Lewis (1949: 1-22), it is stated that, "Most industries must export or die." To this end he advised Caribbean governments to attract European and North American companies to set up export industries in the region to meet foreign demand for manufactured goods. It was clear to Lewis that Caribbean markets were too small to render ISI industries viable. His support for a federation and customs union was based upon the idea that this would make it feasible to set up large scale manufacturing enterprises on a regional basis and help to solve the unemployment problem. Labor-intensive ISI industries were to be a part of this program as he saw it.

4. The Abeng tendency emerged in Jamaica in 1969, partly in response to the disintegration of New World. It had a more activist, nationalist and anti-imperialist orientation. Its publication, *Abeng*, continued the debate on the "Lewis Model" and advocated a reduction in foreign investment, a state capitalist orientation and self reliance. These were among the social democratic (i.e. populist-nationalist "democratic socialist") programs of the PNP Manley regime during the 1970's. Thus, Abeng carried on the dependency tradition.

REFERENCES

- AMIN, SAMIR, 1974. *Accumulation on a world scale*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- , 1976. *Unequal development*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- ANDERSON, THOMAS, 1984. *Geopolitics of the Caribbean: minisates in a wider world*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- ASHLEY, PAUL, 1983. The commonwealth and the contemporary world order: the cases of Jamaica and Trinidad. In: Paget Henry and Carl Stone (eds.) *The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- BARAN, PAUL, 1957. *The political economy of growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- BECKFORD, GEORGE L., 1972. *Persistent poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- BENN, DENNIS, 1984. The commonwealth Caribbean and the new international economic order. In: Anthony Payne and Paul Sulton (eds.) *Dependency under challenge: the political economy of the commonwealth Caribbean*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- BEST, LLOYD, 1971a. Size and survival. In: Norman Girvan and Owen Jefferson (eds), *Reading in the political economy of the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: New World Group.

———, 1971b. Independent thought and freedom in the Caribbean. In: Norman Girvan and Owen Jefferson (eds.), *Readings in the political economy of the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: New World Group.

BEST, LLOYD and LEVITT, KARI, 1969. *Externally propelled industrialization in the Caribbean*. Montreal, (Unpublished).

BODENHEIMER, S., 1972. *The ideology of developmentalism: the American political science paradigm – surrogate for Latin American studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

BRENNER, ROBERT, 1977. The origins of capitalist development: a critique of neo-Smithian Marxism. *New Left Review* 104, July–August.

BREWSTER, HAVELOCK, 1973. Economic dependence: a quantitative interpretation. *Social and Economic Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 1.

BREWSTER, HAVELOCK and THOMAS, CLIVE, 1965. *The dynamics of West Indian economic integration*. Kingston, Jamaica: ISER, University of the West Indies.

BROWN, ADLITH and BREWSTER, HAVELOCK, 1974. Review of the study of economics in the English-speaking Caribbean. *Social and Economic Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 1.

CHILCOTE, RONALD H., 1983. Introduction: dependency or mode of production? Theoretical issues. In: Ronald H. Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds.), *Theories of development: mode of production or dependency?* Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

DEMAS, WILLIAMS G., 1965. *The economics of development in small countries with special reference to the Caribbean*. Montreal, McGill University Press.

ERISMAN, MICHAEL, 1982. Colossus challenged: U.S. Caribbean policy in the 1980's. In: Michael H. Erisman and John D. Martz (eds.) *Caribbean influence*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

ERISMAN, M. and MARTZ, JOHN, 1982. *Colossus challenged: the struggle for Caribbean influence*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

FARRELL, TREVOR, 1983. Decolonization in the english-speaking Caribbean: Myth or Reality. In: Paget Henry and Carl Stone (eds.), *The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development*.

FRANK, ANDRE GUNDER, 1969. *Latin America: underdevelopment or revolution*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

———, 1972. *Lumpenbourgeoisie: lumpenddevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

FROBEL, F., HEINRICH, J. and KREYE, O., 1980. *The new international division of labor, structural unemployment in industrialized countries and industrialization in developing countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FURTADO, CELSO, 1963. *The economic growth of Brazil: a survey from colonial to modern times*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

GIRVAN, NORMAN, 1972. *Foreign capital and economic underdevelopment in Jamaica*. Kingston, Jamaica: ISER, University of the West Indies.

———, 1978. *Corporate imperialism: conflict and expropriation. Transnational corporations and economic nationalism in the Third World*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

GIRVAN, NORMAN, and JEFFERSON, OWEN, 1971. *Readings in the political economy of the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: New World Group.

GREENE, J. EDWARD, 1974. A review of Political Science research in the English-speaking Caribbean: toward a methodology. *Social and Economic Studies*, vol. 23, March.

JAGAN, CHEDDI, 1967. *The West on trial: the fight for Guyana's freedom*. New York: International Publishers.

JEFFERSON, OWEN, 1972. Professor Lewis and the Caribbean economy. *Daily Gleaner*, 17 May.

JOHNSON, CARLOS, 1979. *Dependency theory and the capitalist and socialist process*. Montreal: Center for Developing Area Studies. McGill University.

JOHNSON, CARLOS, 1983. Ideologies in theories of imperialism and dependency. In: Ronald H. Chilcote and Dale L. Johnson (eds.), *Theories of development: mode of production or dependency?* Beverley Hills: Sage Publications Ltd.

LEWIS, VAUGHAN A., (ed.), 1976. *Size, self-determination and international relations: the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: ISER, University of the West Indies.

———, 1983. Caribbean state systems and the contemporary world order. In: Paget Henry and Carl Stone (eds.), *The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

———, 1984. Commonwealth Caribbean relations with hemisphere middle powers. In: Anthony Payne and Paul Sutton (eds.) *Dependency under challenge: the political economy of the commonwealth Caribbean*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

LEWIS, W.A., 1949. Industrial development in Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Economic Review*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1-2.

———, 1950. Industrialization of the British West Indies. *Caribbean Economic Review*. Vol. 2, No. 1.

MANLEY, MICHAEL, 1982. *Jamaica: struggle in the periphery*. London.

MCINTYRE, ALLISTER, 1971. Caribbean economic community. In: Norman Girvan and Owen Jefferson (eds.), *Readings in the political economy of the Caribbean*. Kingston, Jamaica: New World Group.

MUNROE, TREVOR, 1972. *The politics of constitutional decolonization in Jamaica 1944-1962*. Mona, Jamaica: Institute for Social and Economic Research University of the West Indies.

———, 1981. *The marxist left in Jamaica 1944-1952*. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies. Working Papers Series.

OXAAL, IVAR, 1975. The dependency economist as grassroots politician in the Caribbean. In: Ivar Oxaal, Tony Barnett and David Booth, *Beyond the sociology of development: economy and society in Latin America and Africa*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

OXAAL, IVAR, BARNETT, TONY and BOOTH, DAVID, 1975. *Beyond the sociology of development: economy and society in Latin America and Africa*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PALMA, GABRIEL, 1978. Dependency: a formal theory of underdevelopment or a methodology for the analysis of concrete situations of underdevelopment. *World Development*, Vol. 6, No. 7/8.

PARRIS, CARL. D., 1983. Resource ownership and the prospects for democracy: the case of Trinidad and Tobago. In: Paget Henry and Carl Stone (eds.), *The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

RADOSH, RONALD, 1969. *American labor and United States foreign policy: the cold war in the Unions from Gompers to Lovestone*. New York: Random House.

RAMSARAM, RAMESH F., 1984. Issues in commonwealth Caribbean – United States relations. In: Anthony Payne and Paul Sutton (eds.), *Dependency under challenge: the political economy of the commonwealth Caribbean*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

RODNEY, WALTER, 1972. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

———, 1975. *Groundings with my brothers*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

SHIROKOV, GLERY, 1985. *The Industrial Revolution in the East*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

STONE, CARL, 1983. Decolonization and the Caribbean state system: the case of Jamaica. In: Paget Henry and Carl Stone (eds.), *The newer Caribbean: decolonization, democracy and development*. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

SUNKEL, OSVALDO, 1972. Big business and dependencia. *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 50, April.

SUTTON, PAUL, 1984. Trinidad and Tobago: oil capitalism and the 'presidential power' of Eric Williams. In: Anthony Payne and Paul Sutton (eds.), *Dependency under challenge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

TAYLOR, JOHN G., 1979. *From modernization to modes of production: a critique of the sociologies of development and underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan.

THOMAS, CLIVE Y., 1974. *Dependence and transformation: the economics of the transition to socialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

———, 1986. *The rise of the authoritarian state in peripheral societies*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

WATSON, HILBOURNE A., 1975. *The political economy of foreign investment in the Commonwealth Caribbean since World War II*. Ph.D Dissertation, Howard University.

———, 1981. *Non-capitalist development and the Commonwealth Caribbean: a critique of its theoretical conceptions*. Paper presented at the Caribbean Studies Association, Sixth Annual Conference held in St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, May 27–29.

———, 1984. Imperialism, national security and the state in the Caribbean: issues on the development of the authoritarian state. In: Alma H. Young and Dion Phillips (eds.), *Militarization in the non-Hispanic Caribbean*. Boulder, Colorado, Lynn Reiner.

———, 1986. *Economic restructuring under export-led growth in Barbados: state, race and class*. Department of political science, Howard University, Washington, D.C., Mimeographed.

WILL, MARVIN, 1982. The struggle for influence and survival: the United States – microstate Caribbean interface, in: Michael H. Erisman and John D. Martz (eds.), *Colossus challenged: the struggle for Caribbean influence*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

HILBOURNE A. WATSON,
Department of Political Science
Howard University
Washington, D.C. 20059, U.S.A.