



Latin American theory on dependency and marginality: Revisiting aníbal quijano to analyse extractivism

Iván Ojeda Pereira¹, Fernando Campos-Medina²

¹ Department of Sociology, University of Chile, Chile

² Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Chile, Chile

Abstract

The present text, from an interpretative and essayist perspective, exhibits transversal elements of the approach to dependency and also of the discussion on marginality in Latin America. From now on, it is argued that it is necessary to recover that approach from a relational, complex, and integrative approach, in which the internal and external dialectic includes economic, political, social, and cultural aspects. This is in order to enrich global knowledge on the processes of power distribution nowadays, which have generated new modes of marginality. Among them, the marginality related to extractivism, relevant to understand the confluence of discom fort that converge in social outbreak.

Keywords: dependency theory, environmental sociology, Latin American studies, territory theories, reflection

Introduction

By using the essayistic format, I have considered the importance of adding the author as an active entity inside the text. Due to this, from now on, I will sometimes use the first person, with the purpose of making visible the existence of a thinking being behind the lines you are about to read. It is impossible for me to kickstart this manuscript without revealing the enriching experience that its production represents. As we all know, writing is the exact opposite to a mechanical process; each word, phrase and sentence being linked has its own intentionality and specificity. No text is the same as another and what is in that difference is the locus of the experience of the author. No matter how much you think about a topic, there is always a singularity element. On one side, it is based on the own comprehensive experience of the context and the literature, and on the other, it is based on your own experience, which constitutes diverse manners of giving sense to ideas.

Following this line, it is even more interesting for the present text to be understood as a journey. A trip where I searched high and low for the history of the Latin American Social Theory, a journey which baseline was a colloquial Facebook post. Then, the adventure follows basing it on what I have called as a time skip, where the idea of the past as analytical content of history and the present as analytical content of the sociology is addressed. So, where would be the boundaries? The moment that just occurred is already part of the past, but is it already out of the scope of sociology? Certainly, is not. The time skips that permitted this journey encompasses the fuzzy edges of temporality and also the capacity of linking between the different levels of history. The episodic, conjunctural, and long term (*longue durée*) coexist, overlap and are constituted dialectically in different presents (Braudel, 2002; Pierson, 2011) ^[1, 2].

The manuscript converges with the experience that Eduardo Armstrong and Oskar Themo Lobos illustrated in the Chilean comic strip *Mampato*, a journey with the Spatiotemporal Belt.

Analysis of Latin America: The Empire of the caucasian

It becomes impossible to develop a sociological essay without previously building its relevance, a sense of intellectual and corporate importance and which goes beyond the desk and the coffee. The ability of problematization begins from a social way of thinking that raises the sight off the computer and become part of the social, political, and cultural processes that have been configured inside the Latin American societies. As a consequence, there will be not only scientific research but also critical thinking regarding these processes. From a time to date, sociological positivism in some universities, and the intellectual-thematic twist, have been shaping a kind of sociology thar barely differs from the science of data, complex computational work, and statistics that in some point will become the conclusion itself (Ruiz, 2006). The methodology for the methodology, which is mainly focused on creating big explanatory models, that are able to manage millions of cases (González, 2019), but where did reflection, interpretation, and action go along this process? Nowadays, it is urgent for sociology to be capable of develop itself in an integral way, always taking care of its interpretative and analytical dimension, thus, the essayistic labour becomes a need for interdisciplinary revindication.

The current context of Latin America is quite problematic on a social, political, and economic level. The different turns to neoliberalism occurred between de 70s and the 90s have led into different models in Latin America, nevertheless, they possess a common denominator, referred to the growing social outrage incubated in these nations, process that during 2019 led to a wave of social outbreaks (Cavalcanti, 2019) ^[5]. Chile, Venezuela, Bolivia, Paraguay, Perú, Equator and Colombia are just a few examples of nations in the middle of a crisis. Even though the theme diversity of the specific detonators of the outbreaks is heterogeneous, it oscillates between setbacks in support legislation and State recognition of the indigenous people, and the rise in public transportation fares (Cavalcanti, 2019) ^[5]. It is

considered sociologically insufficient to keep an approach to protests which is focused solely and exclusively on understanding parcelled situations, because this way, the point of view of the global dialectic of structure/process is lost (Cardoso & Faletto, 1978) ^[6]. Until now, that has been the logic of the analysis, moreover, it is still colonized by press articles that address the informative and/or analytical aspect, relegating to last, the possibility of a global approach.

There is no case where this implies losing sight of specificity, but, conversely, what is proposed is the possibility of recovering the structural globality as a comprehensive element, as long as both dimensions are fed by their dialectical relation (Cardoso & Faletto, 1978) ^[6]. Each country possesses their own multidimensional specificities at a multilevel, nevertheless, all of these nations are also part of Latin America. Following this line, revealing global structural dimensions becomes elemental. It is necessary and it enriches constructively the sociological activity. This not only allows an advance at an intellectual level, but also amplifies the view beyond nations, towards the locus of our culture and the capacity for action that this historical moment puts in the hands of Latin American People.

From now on, this essay will be focusing on the exposure of a historical, conceptual journey approaching the dependency of Latin America, as an analytical frame for capitalism in the subcontinent. In this regard, it is argued that it is mandatory to recover that theoretical corpus from a relational, complex, and integrative approach, where the internal/external dialectic includes the economic, political, social, and cultural aspects. This is done in order to enrich the global knowledge about the processes of power distribution in the present time, which have generated a new marginality, which is known as extractive. For this purpose, a special focus is set on the contributions of Aníbal Quijano, as in his first dependency moment in the 60s as in his later in time thoughts on postcolonial debate in the 90s (Quijano-Valencia, 2018) ^[7]. This hypothesis lies not only in a need for theoretical revindication, but also in the search for a way out of a historical crossroads, highlighting the need to think about possible courses of action, as it is stated in the last lines of the conclusion of “*Dependencia y Desarrollo en América Latina*” (Cardoso & Faletto, 1978) ^[6], being the only solution, the advance to socialism. Nowadays, from the complex relativization to the approach to dependency, courses of action must be proposed in the tenor of the current political crises in Latin America.

The approach to dependency. Why? Who? And how?

It was the 20th century and the world had just come out of barbaric; the World Wars closed and open new eras in the history of mankind. Recently founded United Nations created offices in different continents (and some subcontinents), to monitor the way in which nations that have gone recently through processes of independence -as a consequence to the end of the war- will get into a world economy (Rodríguez, 1980). This is how the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL) is created. Albeit this constitutes a problem itself, because the CEPAL is located in a subcontinent where there was already a historical experience building Nation States, that lasted about a hundred years.

What underlies the idea of these offices, is a Rodowstonian understanding of the economic growth as a continuum, in which several steps are being burnt (Slater, 1999) ^[9]. At some point, this

‘retarded’ societies should build a momentum, should have a take-off. In this regard and very much against those notions, the economist and director of CEPAL, Raúl Prebisch, headed the approach to a complete alternate notion, the Capelina theory of center-periphery (Prebisch, 2012; Rodríguez, 1980) ^[11, 8]. In a broad sense, this trend suggests that development should be understood as a relational dynamic, in which underdeveloped countries cannot reach development, because they are divergent and co-dependent paths (Rodríguez, 1980; Torres, 1979) ^[8, 12]. Following this line, it is clear that, while Latin America sells its raw material to central countries that will manufacture products and send them back to Latin America to sell them at a higher value, it is shaping a growing deterioration in terms of trade (Solorza & Cetré, 2011) ^[13]. Thus, with the passing of time, you must sell more raw material in order to obtain the sophisticated product from the central nation, which accounts for a perverse dynamic for the peripheries.

Subsequently, several intellectuals started to work with the support of CEPAL, among them, Medina Echeverría, who in his text “*Consideraciones sociológicas al desarrollo económico en América Latina*” (1964), discusses with CEPAL based on two major critics. Firstly, its structuralism, that leaves Latin America as a simple reflection of the invariable external terms, and secondly, its evident economicism, considered as a comprehensive limit to the ‘problem of development’. Thus, it inserts social elements into the discussion and lays the basis for the debate that converges to the dependency approach.

When we talk about approach instead of theory, what appears is the opportunity to understand a way of approaching Latin America as an object of analysis, where homogeneity is not necessarily present (Hernández, 2005; Solorza & Cetré, 2011) ^[15, 13]. On the other hand, regarding the dependency theory, there are countless of stances and debates, from Mauro Marini’s Marxism (1991), and its Altusarian variant by Gunder Frank (1970) ^[17]. Dos Santos interpretations of imperialism (1978, 2002). Weberians trends as Germani (1962) ^[20] and Medina Echeverría (1964). Finally, there are less orthodox stances, that open groundbreaking sociological lines, such as Cardoso and Faletto (1978) ^[6], and Quijano (1970) ^[21]. These last ones are pretty interesting because, although they have diverted from the other trends, they keep a dependent approach that adds new thematic and new perspectives to centrality.

The work of Cardoso and Faletto (1978) ^[6] is undoubtedly a really influential text for the dependency approach, here it is somehow discussed with the Capelian structuralism and also with the Altusarian Marxism. Roughly, the authors raise a double proposal. The first one contemplates the dialectic of structure/process for the understanding of the constant construction of Latin American reality. Meanwhile, the second one considers the relationship between internal and external power, that would allow us to understand how, according to the same external influence, diverse political, economic, and social situations are formed.

In this context of the dependency approach is where we want to address Aníbal Quijano -inside the logic of time skips set out in the introduction of this essay- as a key part of the debate. Quijano is a fascinating author, due to his participation in different disputes. On the one hand, he argues the existence of a colonial epistemology, where Latin American Social Sciences have built a mirror which reflection is what we are not, therefore, the Latin

American problem is to stop being what we are not, disarm a reflection in which we are not (Quijano-Valencia, 2018) ^[7]. Later, he also took part in the discussion around the character of marginality and power in Latin America. According to Quijano, the logic of the Reserve army of labour cannot be entirely overlapped with the experience of the subcontinent, instead, the specificities must be considered. Just as the way in which power works, where it shares arguments with the internal/external dialectic. At a general level, there is evidence of Quijano contributing with a new dimension surrounding the approach to dependency, an eagerness on specificity that recalls Mariátegui, where the civilizing principle of colonization is discussed. Thus, coloniality as a cultural element of Latin America also possess a horizon of self-improvement and action, which forward horizon is decoloniality. Quijano always keeps his own nuance, an Andean essence that, if you want to, is possible to call as an indigenous anthropological perspective, absent in the other authors mentioned.

As it has been established in these lines, it is difficult to talk about the dependency theory only, due to in this discussions, different sensibilities and different analytic scopes meet, whereby, it is considered more concise to talk about a "Dependency Approach", in which Quijano was inserted during the 60s.

Aníbal Quijano: marginality and dependence?

There are some lectures, as the ones of Polo (2016) ^[25], where, in spite of revealing the relation between the dependency theory, the power coloniality theory and the theory of marginality, the latter continues to be based on common themes. The main limitation for this type of understanding is, in my opinion, the attempts to classify the Latin American thinking into a distinctive categorization eagerness. Here, dependency gets lost from sight as an approach which main characteristic refers to its epistemological base to access the Latin America phenomena. Specifically, this base considers the internal/external dialectic as a comprehensive point of view. Indeed, the dependency approach seems to be a broad intellectual veil, where -as we have seen in the previous paragraph- the authors brought to the fore different dimensions and topics, expanding and imploding the postulates of the approach. Following this line, the power coloniality theory and the marginality theory do not appear to be different from the dependency approach, but, as part of the same corpus of Latin American thinking.

Our journey leads us to a time skip to the 60s, when the concept of marginality becomes relevant in Latin America. This concept does not emerge from the full of caffeine brains of some intellectuals of the subcontinent, on the contrary, is emerged from a concrete historical experience. The benefactor states of the 60s, attached to the ideas of modernisation and industrialization were decided to integrate social actors historically excluded and to guarantee their basic rights (Enríquez, 2007) ^[26]. One of the problematics that had arisen is that, while the industrial processes advance (Hinkelammert, 1974) ^[27], the benefits of modernisation are restricted and benefactor state cannot fulfil its promise. On the other hand, the groups that were marginalized from the benefits started to grow (Enríquez, 2007) ^[26]. In a broad sense, the rhythm of modernisation does not go as fast as different social groups, in this context, the debate on marginality increases. In one side, there is the full scope of structural functionalists related to

developmentalism (no critical vision), and in the other side, the historic-structural perspective (critical).

For the first one, marginality is a situational phenomenon, where one side of the population does not enter the spectrum of benefits from capitalism because they do not wish to enter the system of production, interpreting traditional social groups as marginated (Germani, 1962) ^[20]. According to this, modernisation of power and society should transform this marginal population, promoting integration. El cleavage formed here belongs to social marginality versus social integration. Unwillingly, critical perspective inserted to marginality in a productive structure society, hence, it is a problem of a structural order transcending capitalism. Henceforth, the perspective is divided. Firstly, into the most Marxist proposal, related to the Reserve army of labour (Cardoso, 1966) ^[28], then, into a second hypothesis by José Nun (2003) that coins the concept of "marginal mass", and finally, Quijano's proposal of "marginal pole" (1970) ^[21].

Quijano proposes to understand the long-term processes in a constant relationship with the historical memory and cultural route of Latin America, that adds an important piece of singularity and uniqueness regarding positivism and orthodox Marxism. An ongoing reference to the Andean world can be found in his work because, for the author, the intellectual ideas must be immersed in a certain point of view (Mythos and Logos), not constituted by a process of occidental replica. Thus, he expects to know the prevailing trends in the socio-historical process to propose, from there, the need for a historical and logical horizon, different from the one imposed by the Eurocentric modernity (Ríos, 2019) ^[33]. His proposal of a new social order was not merely fantasy, but part of the development of a specific reality.

Quijano's perspective regarding marginality (1970a), is undoubtedly a great contribution, because it manages to link an external dynamic of dependency with an internal structural process of marginality. Quijano recovers Nun's considerations around the pressure and reserve on the salaries in order to distinguish a marginalized population from the Reserve army of labour (Enríquez, 2007, p.65) ^[26]. Nonetheless, he differs from Nun's perspective (2003), arguing that the marginal pole in Latin America is not completely excluded from a social system, that would result in an ideal of dual society. On the other hand, it is impossible for the marginal pole to access higher productivity and more important roles, being forced to develop economic activities of less importance. Later, Quijano (1970b; 1998) ^[21] confirms the idea of being part of the marginal pole implies being part of the social system in a non-relevant position, in something like unequal structural integration.

Quijano (1966; 1967; 1968; 1972) ^[22, 34, 35, 36], winks what would be known nowadays as urban sociology, in its interface with urbanism; giving an account of how economic dependence across nations, alongside with the internal marginalization processes, would not remain in an abstract, but would result in the construction of cities and urban characteristics. It is interesting that Quijano does not drastically break his previous steps, conversely, he tends to revitalize and even self-critic his own work. His contribution from "cholificación", theory of marginal pole and power coloniality, could be confined in their own line of thought, supported by the dependency approach, always considering the external/internal dialectic.

Adding an own interpretation, I consider that one of the greatest features of Quijano's contribution is that they are linkable in their different times. Following this line, marginality can go hand in hand with a way of exerting and conceiving power, where international configurations, alongside with nations, socially target certain groups as more conducive to marginality. The relationship between dependency and marginality has been suggested by different authors (Cortés, 2012; 2017; Polo 2016; 2018) ^[37, 38, 25]. nevertheless, in my view, those suggestions are seen as separate proposals that must be understood as different parts of the same global proposal that, in the case of Quijano, permits to open analytical lines regarding the character of the State.

Latin America and extractive marginality

Finishing our journey to the 60s and the 90s and, once again, let us trust in the present of Latin America. Before the pandemic we are suffering, the subcontinent was affected by a global socio-political conflict. As it was mentioned in the introduction, a set of protests and demonstrations created an uncertain scene, but at the same time full of hope. So, what is Quijano's contribution in order to understand the present times?

Conceiving how power is organized, its way of taking roots and expansion, allow us to know "what can be done" and "how much it cost". Undoubtedly for Latin America, power is still by the hand of complex national and international network, in a way that it does not only work with colonial logics, but also with a network of double dominance interests. It is impossible to approach the social outbreaks in an isolated way, ignoring history. On the other hand, and just like Quijano taught us, outbreaks must be exhibited as historical moments where the limit of the acceptable is exceeded. In other words, a stockpile of disconformity meets at a point. Among the many elements that converge here, it seems pertinent to discuss those of territorial order (Svampa, 2019) ^[40]. Regarding this point, I will now propose a marginality category linked to extractivism in Latin America that, without a doubt, has been core in the stacking of discomfort. Accordingly, the properly extractive interests rest on dependency, colonialism, and marginality.

At first instance, it refers to dependency, due to extractivism comes from a basal line of a primary export model, that consists in the selling of raw material to an open international market. Even though some nations of the subcontinent have tried to keep their models of selective industrialisation, all of them maintain business clusters of significant contribution to GDP. Henceforward, the dependent logic operates at the time when the property and bonding regime overlap national and foreign capitals linked through processes of invisibility of the owners. Stock exchange and joint-stocks companies blur the determined edges of extractivism from the early 1900s in Latin America and give an account for new ways of dependentist social relations.

The board and shareholders seem to be a space where interests are found and decisions regarding territories are taken, generating different situations for nations and, at the same time, for the regions. It is quite unfair to compare the Amazons with Vila Nova Conceicao in Sao Paulo; or the sacrifice zone of Quintero-Puchuncaví versus the rich city of Las Condes in Santiago, Chile. Subsequently, capital distribution allows to enrich the national elite, and to maintain processes of national and international domination, i.e., power from the outside being applied in the

inside and power from the inside to the inside, that depend on themselves to endure.

At a cultural level, colonial logic still penetrates political systems, the same way it can affect the behaviour of some groups. Moreover, most of the political systems use criteria that are not constituted by the maximum interest of the citizenship subsistence, instead, they are based on a production model in charge of the constant destruction of the territory, nevertheless, this is often interpreted as 'development', 'civilization', 'progress' or 'growth'. Insane. The reason? So these products can be exported. But before it, there is a second process as complex as the first one, the opinion of the communities regarding the evil models are quite heterogeneous. Most of the time, local communities are not opposed to development, but continue to picture their reality based on fictitious and Eurocentric criteria, where getting to Miami by yacht or purchasing a mansion in Europe, has more value than running your own lifestyle.

Finally, when we talk about an extractivist marginality, we are talking about that territorial linking in charge of this kind of job, where communities are annexed through the transformation of job offers. These projects indeed, during their first years, are profitable for local communities, especially if we consider the evident poor conditions of the territory before the arriving of the projects. So, through selective integration, the locals are displaced from their transformative locus and inserted into the commodity chain, establishing an internal economic dependence which affects these means of production. Shortly after that, the project ends up absorbing every kind of resource. Is it possible that big mining companies could coexist with animal husbandry? Or will agriculture coexist with wood industry?

Despite the fact this reading could seemed a little far from what has been propose through this essay, it converges syntactically the different contents recovered, revealing the need for considering the dependency approach from a complex conceptualization.

Conclusion

Finally, we are about to conclude what I have called a trip with time skips. Throughout this text, many hypotheses around the dependency approach have been revisited, and it has been proved that they are currently relevant when discussing capitalism in Latin America. About that issue, it is extremely important to add new interpretative jobs that surpass the expanding positivism and not only to repeat scholastically what has already been said, but also to begin using those conceptualizations in different topics that nowadays afflict the Latin American reality, as extractivism and the increase in the confluence of conflicts.

Aníbal Quijano is an author that has left a mark in different sociology schools of Latin America; indeed, I would say that it is impossible to study the becoming of the future of the subcontinent without previously revisit Quijano. All over this trip, I have had the opportunity to get into his mind, and to immerse in the different debates he had over his intellectual life. I believe that the role of history and culture, alongside with the external/internal dialectic, are fundamental elements that must be highlighted. In times where sociology is being confused with other data manager sciences, I ask you: what does keep us together as a discipline? In my opinion, it is the reflective ability of social interpretation of the information we possess. Undoubtedly, Quijano would call upon us to develop that job, and

not losing from sight the analysis of Latin America and for Latin America, that will contribute on the building of a new logical horizon.

Before the growing barbaric in the continent, characterized by the alarming inequality, marginality (those from the past, the present and the future), state violence, and destruction of territories, it is harder than ever not to fall in a deep defeatism. Nevertheless, we have to gain the force to surpass the complex current scenario and move forward to real alternatives, which will once and for all, break the chains of colonialism in Latin America. Now, the chances of that construction are attached to the wills of those in charge of the political and social projects behind, that that transcend temporal and spatial dimensions.

Acknowledgements

"Fernando Campos, acknowledges funding from the Institutional Excellence Stimulus Program (PEEI) of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Chile through its Competition for the Strengthening of Productivity and Continuity of Research (FPCI) 2019-I. Iván Ojeda Pereira, thanks the support of the Centre for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies - COES (ANID/FONDAP/15130009)".

References

1. Braudel F. *La historia y las ciencias sociales* (Madrid, Alianza Editorial, 2002).
2. Pierson P. *Politics in time: History, institutions, and social analysis* (Woodstock, Princeton University Press, 2011).
3. Ruiz C. *La política en el Neoliberalismo: Experiencias Latinoamericanas* (Santiago, LOM, 2019).
4. González F. Big data, algoritmos y política: Las ciencias sociales en la era de las redes digitales, *Cinta de moebio*, 2019:(65):267-280.
5. Cavalcanti L. *¿Qué está ocurriendo en Sudamérica?* CIPER CHILE, 2019, <https://www.ciperchile.cl/2019/11/19/que-esta-ocurriendo-en-sudamerica/>
6. Cardoso F, Faletto E. *Dependencia y Desarrollo en América Latina: Ensayo de interpretación sociológica* (México D.F., Siglo XXI, 1978).
7. Quijano-Valencia O. Para dejar de ser lo que no somos, *Teuken Bidikay*, 2018:9(13):25-35.
8. Rodríguez O. *La teoría del subdesarrollo de la CEPAL* (México D.F., Siglo XXI, 1980).
9. Slater F. Las etapas del crecimiento económico de Rostow. Consideraciones sobre el Evolucionismo como Modelo interpretativo, *Soñando el Sur*, 1999:2:114-121.
10. Benavente A. Estallidos sociales y escenarios de ingobernabilidad, *Revista Enfoques*, 2004:2(2):121-230.
11. Prebisch R. *El desarrollo económico de la América Latina y algunos de sus principales problemas* (Santiago, CEPAL, 2012).
12. Torres C. *Teoría de la dependencia: Nota crítica sobre su metodología histórico- estructural*, *Nueva Sociedad*, 1979:42:70-86.
13. Solorza M, Cetré M. La teoría de la dependencia, *Revista Republicana*, 2011:10:127-139.
14. Medina Echavarría J. *Consideraciones sociológicas sobre el desarrollo económico de América Latina* (Buenos Aires, Solar/Hachette, 1964).
15. Hernández R. La dependencia a debate. *Latinoamérica, Revista de Estudios Latinoamericanos*, 2005:(40):11.
16. Marini RM. *Dialéctica de la dependencia* (México D.F., Ediciones ERA, 1991).
17. A. Gunder Frank, *Capitalismo y subdesarrollo en América Latina* (Buenos Aires, Signos, 1970).
18. Dos Santos T. *Imperialismo y dependencia* (México D.F., Ediciones ERA, 1978).
19. Dos Santos T. *Teoría de la dependencia. Balance y perspectivas* (México D.F., Plaza y Janés, 2002).
20. Germani G. *Política y sociedad en una época de transición. De la sociedad tradicional a la sociedad de masas* (Buenos Aires, Paidós, 1962).
21. A. Quijano, *Polo marginal y mano de obra marginal* (Santiago, CEPAL, 1970a).
22. A. Quijano, *El Proceso de Urbanización en Latinoamérica (Esquema de un marco de revisión de la problemática)* (Santiago, CEPAL, 1966).
23. Fernández F. *Las clases sociales en América Latina: Problemas de conceptualización* (México D.F., Siglo XXI, 1973).
24. Mariátegui J. *7 Ensayos de Interpretación de la Realidad Peruana* (Lima, Biblioteca Amauta, 1928).
25. Polo J. Teoría de la dependencia y colonialidad del poder. Dos ángulos de una misma dominación/Theory of dependency and coloniality of power. Two angles of the same domination, *Revista San Gregorio*, 2016:1(11):6-17.
26. Enríquez P. *De la marginalidad a la Exclusión Social: Un mapa para recorrer sus conceptos y núcleos problemáticos*, *Fundamentos en Humanidades*, 2007:8(15):57-88.
27. Hinkelammert F. *Teoría de la dependencia y colonialidad del poder. Dos ángulos de una misma dominación* (Buenos Aires, Contraseña, 1974).
28. Cardoso F. *Problemas del subdesarrollo latinoamericano* (México D.F., Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1966).
29. Nun J. *Marginalidad y exclusión social* (Buenos Aires, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003).
30. Quijano A. *Redefinición de la Dependencia y Marginalización en América Latina* (Santiago, CESO, 1970b).
31. A. Quijano, *Economía popular y sus caminos en América Latina* (Lima, Mosca Azul, 1998).
32. Zavaleta Mercado R. *El poder Dual* (México D.F., Siglo XXI, 1974).
33. Ríos J.R. Aníbal Quijano: Hacia un nuevo horizonte de sentido histórico de una civilización de vida, *Revista de Sociología*, 2019:(28):83-102.
34. A. Quijano, *Dependencia, Cambio Social y Urbanización en Latinoamérica* (Santiago, CEPAL, 1967).
35. A. Quijano, *Urbanización y Tendencias de cambio en la Sociedad Rural Latinoamericana* (Santiago, CIDU, 1968).
36. A. Quijano, La Constitución del "Mundo" de la Marginalidad Urbana, *EURE*, 1972:2(5):89-106.
37. A. Cortés, Modernización, dependencia y marginalidad: Itinerario conceptual de la sociología latinoamericana, *Sociologías*, 2012:14(29), 214-238.
38. Cortés A. Aníbal Quijano: Marginalidad y urbanización dependiente en América Latina, *Polis*, 2017, 46,

39. Polo J. Colonialidad múltiple en América Latina: Estructuras de dependencia, relatos de subalternidad, *Latin American Research Review*, 2018;53(1):111-125.
40. Svampa M. Las fronteras del neoextractivismo en América Latina (Bielefeld, Bielefeld University Press, 2019).