

Theories and trends

Latin American Indigenous International Relations

Theory: Autonomous Theory and Its Evaluation

Zhao Hui

Abstract: The Latin American autonomy theory was born in the 1970s. Its early representatives were the Brazilian scholar Jagua Ribe and the Argentinian scholar Puig. Both of them served as the Brazilian Minister of Science and Technology and the Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs respectively. The autonomy theory is based on Latin American developmentalism and Latin American developmentism. Dependency theory is the source of thought. It breaks through the established framework of mainstream Western international relations theory, treats peripheral countries as "subjects" rather than "objects" in international relations research, and builds theory around the core concern of Latin American countries - autonomy. The theory of autonomy believes that sovereign equality masks the inequality of international power, and that the anarchic order of the international system masks the hierarchical order composed of countries with varying degrees of autonomy. It also emphasizes that the domestic elite groups of peripheral countries are crucial to maintaining or changing the state of dependence. In response to the problem of the way out for peripheral countries, the theory of autonomy proposes that in addition to the options of dependence and revolution, peripheral countries have a third way - autonomy. They can formulate and implement policies consistent with the international system by creatively using the maneuvering space provided by the international system. The strategic goal of self-interest is to eventually get rid of dependence on the central country and achieve independent development. As a feasible path, the autonomy theory links autonomy with integration and advocates like-minded peripheral countries to implement a common integration strategy together to form a coherent, a cohesive system, expand resources and market base, increase production scale, promote endogenous development, and improve collective bargaining power at the international level.

Keywords: Autonomy theory, Peripheral countries developmentalism, Dependency theory integration

Author introduction: Zhao Hui, Senior Editor of Xinhua News Agency, PhD candidate, Department of Latin America, University of

Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, CLC Classification Number:

D80 Document Identification Code: A Article Number: 1002 - 6649 (2022) 04-0001-21

Five major changes in diversity.

First, from the east-west perspective to the north-south perspective. Deeply affected by historical reasons such as being a European colony for a long time, Latin American countries have natural ties with the West in terms of ideology, social systems, cultural traditions, ethnic composition, etc. Therefore, the Latin American elite recognized themselves as part of the Western system in terms of self-perception. After World War II, the fact that Latin America was the sphere of influence of the United States was acquiesced by all countries in the world, including the Soviet Union, at the Yalta Conference. Truman promoted the counter-revolution when the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union adopted anti-communist Cold War policies, Latin America was forcibly included in the Western strategic system headed by the United States.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, the United States was mired in the Vietnam War and intensified domestic racial conflicts, weakening its national strength. At the same time, the disintegration of the Bretton Woods system, the outbreak of the oil crisis, the export dividends of raw material producing countries, and the relaxation of U.S.-Soviet relations and U.S.-China relations heralded the adjustment and reshaping of international power relations. These events caused the ruling groups in Latin American countries to begin to doubt the capabilities of the United States and Western countries, and saw the decline of the first world and the decline of the third world. As the world develops and grows, it is possible for developing countries to exert greater influence in restructuring the international economic order. Based on this prediction, when Latin American countries consider their status and role in the future world pattern, they will shift their footing to the south. Paying more attention to the North-South relationship rather than the traditional East-West relationship, the identity of the Third World is also deepening. During this period, President Echeverría of Mexico, President Pérez of Venezuela, President Perón of Argentina, and Guerrero of Brazil President Zéll and other leaders of Latin American countries are actively developing relations with third world countries outside the region.

Second, from automatic alliance to non-alignment. After World War II, in order to strengthen its control over the "backyard", the United States vigorously promoted political and military alliances between Latin American countries and the United States. In 1947, Latin American countries were drawn into the "backyard" created by the United States. Treaty of Mutual Assistance among Inter-American Countries» In 1948, the United States-led Organization of American States was established and became an important tool for the United States to intervene in Latin American affairs. In the early post-war period, 13 Latin American countries signed bilateral military mutual assistance treaties with the United States. The United States established it has established more than 400 military bases. In international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of American States, most Latin American countries have become "voting machines" controlled by the United States. Some large Latin American countries even regard "automatic alliance" with the United States as

the norm of foreign policy. However, with the changes in the international situation in the middle of the Cold War, especially the weakening of the bipolar structure, the resurgence of the "Second World" such as Europe and Japan, and the emergence of a large number of politically independent emerging countries, the popularity of the Non-Aligned Movement has increased globally. Many Latin American countries have also begun to shift from "alignment" to "non-alignment".

ÿ

An Jianguo: "The development of international relations in Latin America after the war", in "Latin American Studies", Issue 3, 1987, page 21. Xiao Feng: "On the development of diplomatic theories

ÿ

and policies of Latin American countries after the war (Part 1)", in "Latin American Studies", Issue 2, 1989, Page 9.

In September 1961, Cuba became the only member of the Non-Aligned Movement in Latin America at that time. In August 1972, the Non-Aligned Movement Foreign Ministers' Meeting was held for the first time in Latin America, setting off a climax for Latin American countries to join the Non-Aligned Movement. In 1974, Kissinger was concerned about the prospect of Latin America "slipping into the Non-Aligned Group and compounding our problems around the world." By the time the Sixth Non-Aligned Movement Summit was held in Havana, Cuba, in September 1979, Latin America had Eleven countries have become official members of the Non-Aligned Movement, and another 11 countries are observer states. Latin American countries have become an important force in the Non-Aligned Movement, especially in the struggle to defend the 200 nautical miles of maritime rights, and have contributed to the majority of third world countries. It played a leading role in safeguarding maritime rights and interests and opposing the maritime hegemonism of superpowers, and ultimately promoted the "United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea" to make clear provisions on the "200-mile exclusive economic zone".

Third, from Pan-Americanism to Latin Americanism. Pan-Americanism was first proposed by Bolivar and others during the Latin American War of Independence. The purpose was to unite Latin American countries to fight against Spain, seek independence, get rid of colonial status, and consolidate and safeguard their own sovereignty. 19 At the end of the century, as the United States entered the overseas expansion stage from the mainland expansion stage, Pan-Americanism began to be used by the United States and became a "big flag" for the United States to accelerate its foreign expansion. Through the frequent use of "big stick policy" and "gold dollar diplomacy", the United States It carried out armed intervention and economic expansion in Latin American countries. On the one hand, it turned some Latin American countries into its own protectorates militarily. On the other hand, it economically squeezed out the influence of European powers in Latin America, causing the region to gradually become a U.S. At the same time, the foreign policies of Latin American countries were subject to arbitrary interference by the United States. After the victory of the Cuban Revolution in 1959, the United States argued that Cuban ideology was incompatible with the Pan-American system, putting the unity of the Western Hemisphere in danger. For this reason, it implemented an isolation policy against Cuba and pushed the Organization of American States to pass a resolution to expel Cuba. By the end of 1964, only Mexico among Latin American countries maintained diplomatic relations with Cuba.

Beginning in the late 1960s, as the economic strength of Latin American countries gradually increased and nationalism continued to rise, calls for reforming the Pan-American system and replacing Pan-Americanism with Latin Americanism became louder and louder. In October 1975, in Mexico Under the initiative of Venezuela and Venezuela, representatives of 23 Latin American governments signed the "Panama Agreement", declaring the establishment of the Latin American Economic System to coordinate the common positions of Latin American countries on economic and social issues and enhance the status of Latin American countries in international dialogue. This is the second step in After the establishment of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America in 1948, the Alliance of Latin American Universities in 1949, the Latin American Free Trade Association in 1960, the Latin American Parliament in 1964, and the Special Coordination Committee for Latin America in 1969, Latin American countries established another organization representing "Latin Americanism". Regional organizations. All these institutions contribute to the development of international law

ÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿ "ŷÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿ: ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿ ŷÿÿÿÿ ŷÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ

Strengthen the concept of "Latin America" at all levels and consciously distance themselves from the United States and the Pan-Americanism it advocates. Fourth, from emphasizing security to emphasizing development. In the early post-war period, in order to curb the development of communism in the Western Hemisphere, the United States actively weaved anti-communist propaganda. The defense and security system cultivated a large number of pro-American and anti-communist right-wing soldiers in Latin America to come to power, and increased military assistance to pro-American governments, consolidating military cooperation between the two sides, uniting against communism, and safeguarding collective security. During this period, Latin America was in conflict between the East and the West. China clearly stands on the side of the United States. The foreign policies of many Latin American countries have been marked by anti-Soviet and anti-communist signs, and the security issue of preventing communist infiltration has been given top priority.

As the world structure evolved from the hegemony of the United States in the early post-war period to the balance of power between the United States and the Soviet Union, the Cold War began to enter a détente stage, and the foreign policies of Latin American countries began to shift from pure strategic security interests to considerations of social and economic development. Many Latin American countries openly rejected the idea of "Latin America and the United States" "There is a special and exclusive relationship between the two countries", and no longer "talk about communism". It strengthened its relations with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in Eastern Europe. The friendly and cooperative relations with China also achieved breakthrough development. In the 1970s, A total of 11 Latin American countries have established diplomatic relations with China. In addition, Latin American economic nationalism has shown a very strong momentum. Internally, it insists on developing the national economy, taking import substitution industrialization as the development path, getting rid of foreign control, and externally safeguarding economic sovereignty and independence. It strongly condemns the exploitation of developing countries by developed countries and the unfair international economic order. However, the United States has ignored and avoided the economic and social development issues of Latin American countries, which has made some countries that had pinned their hopes on changing the backward situation through US assistance and bilateral cooperation. Latin American governments abandoned their illusions. In May 1969, 21 Latin American countries held a meeting in Viña del Mar, Chile, to discuss the issue of unequal economic and trade relations between Latin America and the United States. They publicly expressed their strong dissatisfaction with the United States and emphasized that all countries have the right to freely control its natural resources and the principle that economic cooperation cannot be attached with political or military conditions.

Fifth, from dependence on the United States to foreign diversification. During the national independence and liberation movements at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century, Latin American countries got rid of Western colonial rule and won political independence. However, they were still economically dominated by Western monopoly capital such as Britain and Germany. During World War II, the strength of the United Kingdom declined significantly, and the economic ties between Latin American countries and Europe were basically interrupted. The U.S. monopoly group achieved its goal of squeezing out competitors and seizing economic dominance in the region, thus establishing its economic hegemony in Latin America. For example, in the mid-1970s, U.S. multinational corporations alone controlled 1/5 of the GDP, 1/3 of the industrial production, 2/5 of the exports, and 1/2 of the bank assets of Latin

American countries. With the growth of Latin American national assets and the growth of class power, since the 1960s and 1970s, many Latin American countries have launched large-scale nationalization movements, taking over a large number of foreign-funded enterprises, mainly American-owned enterprises.

• Han Qi: "On the Impact of the Second World War on Latin America", published in "Research on Modern and Contemporary World History", Issue 13, 2016, Page 198. Jiao Zhenheng: "Nationalization Movements in Latin American

• Countries after the Postwar", published in "Latin American Studies", Issue 4, 1987, Page 31.

Yes. Between 1960 and 1976, Latin American countries nationalized about 200 foreign companies, including 158 US-owned companies, 8 British-owned companies, and 34 companies from other countries. At the same time, the proportion of the United States in Latin America's foreign trade has also continued to decline, from 50% in the early post-World War II period to about 40% in the early 1960s. By 1979, the United States accounted for only 34.9% of Latin America's imports and 38% of its exports. U.S. direct investment in Latin America accounted for its foreign investment. The proportion of the total amount also dropped from 38.8% in 1950 to 19.80

3. At the same time, trade and investment in Latin America by Western European countries and Japan increased significantly. Economic and trade exchanges between Latin American countries and the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and other members of the Economic Cooperation Council increased significantly. Relations with developing countries in Asia and Africa increased significantly. Trade exchanges are also becoming increasingly frequent.

Against the background of the relative decline of U.S. hegemony and the rise of autonomous practices in Latin America, international relations research in Latin American circles, especially those in the Southern Cone countries, began to pay close attention to and explore the possibilities and constraints of realizing national interests through autonomous diplomacy. This gave rise to the An academic community with "autonomy" as its core concept. Brazilian scholar Yaguaribe and Argentinian scholar Puig are among the best.

The main points of Erya Guaribe

Yaguaribe, born in 1923, is a well-known Brazilian scholar. He has taught at many universities in the United States. He is also a politician. He participated in the establishment of the Brazilian Social Democratic Party and served as the Minister of Science and Technology of Brazil. As early as his youth, he Yaguaribe once participated in the founding of the Brazilian Institute of Advanced Studies and promoted ideas with a strong developmentalist flavor.

In his article "Dependence and Autonomy in Latin America" published in 1969, Yaguaribe adopted some "diagnostic" results of Latin American developmentalism and pointed out that there are three structural trends of dependence in Latin American countries: stagnation, marginalization and detachment. Nationalization. First, deteriorating terms of trade, incomplete import substitution, and unsustainable external financing have led to economic stagnation, which has also brought about stagnation in political, cultural, and social development. Secondly, with the increasing number of unemployed farmers, Migrating to cities, the poverty belts in central urban areas are becoming larger and larger. This group of people are marginalized in the economic, political, educational and other fields. They are unable to integrate into the industrialization process and can only engage in low-end tertiary industry, leading to social marginalization. Prominent. Once again, denationalization has occurred in strategic economic sectors, cultural levels, and political and military levels. Due to the influence of multinational corporations,

ÿ United Nations Center for Transnational Corporations: «Revisiting the Developing Transnational Corporations in the World», Beijing: Commercial Press, 1982, page 284. Zhang Sengen, Qi Haiyan: «Latin America's Foreign Trade Characteristics and Current Adjustment Measures», in «Latin America Series», No. 3, 1984, page

ÿ 14. Chen Caixing: "The development and changes of foreign direct investment in Latin America after the war", published in "Latin American Studies", No. 2, 1990, page 27,

The second structural condition is "international tolerance" (permisibilidad internacial). The concept of international tolerance is more abstract and refers to a country's geopolitical and international relations. The conditions it possesses to hedge against substantive threats from other countries. These conditions are both It can be internal, such as a country's economic and military strength, or it can be external, such as establishing a defensive alliance with other countries. Take Mexico, Brazil and Argentina, the three major Latin American countries, as examples. Brazil and Argentina have higher international tolerance than Mexico. It is higher and it is easier to enhance autonomy. This is because the United States has a much higher ability to directly intervene in Mexico than in Brazil and Argentina. At the same time, international tolerance is not constant and will become more tense as the international environment becomes tense. For example, under the bipolar structure during the Cold War, international tolerance will change significantly according to the intensity of the confrontation between the two poles. In addition, there are two functional

conditions for autonomy, namely "technology- "Enterprise independence" and "racial-cultural similarity". Typical representatives of technological-enterprise independence are the European Community and Japan. Within the European Community, although France has more political and military independence than West Germany, West Germany's The autonomy is significantly higher than that of France. Jaguaribe believes that this is because West Germany is more independent at the technical and enterprise levels and has more endogenous development momentum. However, countries such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada are less powerful in terms of politics, military and technology. None of them have sufficient conditions for autonomy in business and enterprise. However, because these countries are very close to the United States in race and culture and maintain good relations with the United States, they also enjoy relatively high autonomy within the imperial system.

Yagaribe pointed out that structural conditions are empowerment conditions and have little to do with the foreign policy adopted by a country, but are closely related to the degree of social and cultural integration and the level of people's moral education. Functional conditions are operational conditions and may It will change due to the efforts of peripheral countries or the behavioral changes of central countries. By examining the

development trend of the international pattern from bipolarity to multipolarity, Yagaribe put forward three hypotheses about the future direction of Latin American politics: Continue to maintain the satellite style Dependence, revolution, autonomy. Different from the "inherent instability" of the dependence model or the revolutionary model, the autonomy model has "relative stability". In view of the fact that the US-centered imperial system provides internal services to peripheral countries that conform to the basic interests and values of the United States. This provides considerable room for autonomy. He believes that Latin American countries can choose an "autonomous model of development and integration."

What is scientific sighting: Evening snowflake a snowflake snowflake no scientific a scientific scientific a scientific s slim (s) ess slim s s s s Yes snails snailéy the snails Yes the scientists scientists: Aesthetic s Aesthetic Aesthetics G 2014 G

Nék sliveryy "slingerís slickéyy y no yyy yyy yy yyy and 12y
yy yyy yyyyy y yy

Nék analyzh "aestheticism a s slim slim"herb né slislim s
y yyyíyyy y yyyóyyy yy yyés yyyyyy yyyyyy yyyyyyyyyyyyy yy yyyyyyy yyyyyyy yyyyy y yy

and international tolerance, thereby achieving independence.

Three Puig's main points

Puig, who was born in 1928, is one of the founders of the study of international relations in Argentina. He briefly served as Argentina's foreign minister for two months in 1973. During this period, he prepared negotiations with the United Kingdom on the sovereignty of the Malvinas Islands. He bid farewell to politics due to the resignation of President Campora. In 1976, in order to escape persecution by the military government, Puig went into exile to teach at a university in Venezuela, where he wrote a large number of books and articles on the theory of autonomy. This is a great influence on Puig. Said, the

only way to provide a truly autonomous solution is to "abandon theoretical frameworks based on realities other than our own." Puig 's autonomy theory is based on a historical and political analysis of Argentina and Latin America, and regards autonomy as It is the core category of the foreign policy of Latin American countries and also serves as an expression of popular needs and historical struggles. His representative works include "International Doctrine and Latin American Autonomy" published in 1980, "Malvinas and the International System" published in 1983, "Latin America: A Comparative Foreign Policy" published in 1984, etc.

The tension between anarchy and hierarchy that exists in the international system is the starting point for Puig to construct his theory of autonomy. Puig believes that the international system, like human communities, has a clear division of functions and is divided into It is dominated and managed by a distribution system with the highest effectiveness, that is, someone makes a decision, someone follows it, and someone obeys the decision. He "atomizes" the international society and divides it into three groups: the highest allocator, the lower allocator and the lower allocator. Recipients: The rulers of the United States and the Soviet Union, who possess nuclear weapons and other super deterrent forces, are the highest allocators. Other heads of state and heads of government organizations, non-governmental organizations and multinational corporations are low-level allocators. Everyone else They are all recipients

Through a comprehensive analysis of the impact of new characteristics of the international situation on the international system, such as the decline of the traditional advantages of global powers, the loosening of the stability of the imperial system, and the continuous emergence of new international actors such as OPEC, Puig made the "impermeability between groups" "Internal autonomy within the group" and other judgments. He believed that the Western capitalist camp headed by the United States and the Eastern socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union formed after the end of World War II.

“ ”

”

”

Countries break away from the group dominated by the central country and challenge its global power. This represents the different forms of peripheral countries from colonial-like primitive historical attachment to the ultimate realization of maximum self-determination. However, the logic between these forms is not one-way. It develops linearly, but will change according to the specific international environment, either moving forward or backward. In the quasi-

colonial dependence model, although peripheral countries enjoy sovereignty, they are no different from colonies when participating in international political and economic activities. At best, the government is nothing more than an appendage under the power structure of the central country. It is completely obedient to the top allocator of the central country. Subject to political rule from the outside, the economies of these countries have completely lost their autonomy. They are guided by the interests of the central country and develop vigorously. Resource extraction activities provide central countries with the primary products and raw materials needed for their industrial development, and most of the profits are transferred abroad instead of reinvesting and promoting local economic development. At the same time, the domestic market becomes the market for foreign industrial products. The dumping market for imported goods made it difficult for local handicrafts and manufacturing industries to survive and was on the verge of collapse. With the acquiescence of the central countries, minority groups in these countries enjoyed ultra-high privileges and maintained a form of rule that was incompatible with the modern economy. After independence in 1821, Peru, which has been in a political and economic "semi-colonial" state for a long time, falls into this category.

In the national dependency model, decision-makers in peripheral countries partially perform the duties of the highest domestic allocators. Although the institutionalized national decision-making system is independent of external interference, it is highly restricted by external influence. The ruling group accepts the state of dependence and try to obtain the maximum national interests from external dependence and strive for greater autonomy in the future. They will "rationalize" dependence, formulate their own development goals and national policies based on the dependence situation, seek consistency in the interests of both parties to the dependence, and at the same time contribute to the international system. The senior allocators in the system draw an insurmountable "bottom line". Once the bottom line is touched, peripheral countries will react and even violently resist. For example, Argentina in the 19th century faced the European powers imposing extraterritorial rights on Latin American countries and using When it came to bottom-line behaviors such as using force to collect debts, Argentina showed typical characteristics of national dependence. It successively proposed the Calvo Doctrine and the Drago Doctrine, which gained support from Latin American countries and prevented European powers from intervening in the name of diplomatic protection. It has safeguarded the legitimate rights and interests of its own country and other Latin American countries through its domestic political practices and the use of force to extort contractual debts from other countries.

In the unorthodox autonomy model, under the premise of accepting the leadership of the central country, the decision-makers of peripheral countries fully exercise their responsibilities as the top domestic distributors and enjoy high autonomy in national decision-making involving their own development models, foreign exchange strategies, etc. We must not accept the central state's mechanical and dogmatic imposition of political and strategic considerations based on its own interests on them. At the same time, we can maximize the

1 This is a machine-translated text. The content is a theoretical analysis of international relations models in Latin America, specifically focusing on the concepts of colonial dependence, national dependency, and unorthodox autonomy. The text discusses how peripheral countries interact with a central country, the role of decision-makers, and the impact of external influence on national decision-making. It uses historical examples like Argentina in the 19th century to illustrate these concepts. The text is dense and academic in nature.

On the basis of drawing on the core views of Latin American developmentalism and dependency theory, the classic realist concept of "power" is replaced with a concept of "autonomy" that is more in line with the actual needs of peripheral countries, as a way to defend national sovereignty and development, constrain the behavior of transnational subjects, and enhance international cooperation. Negotiation capabilities, tools to compete with more powerful actors in the international system and safeguard one's own interests.

In Tickner's view, an important contribution of Latin American developmentalism and dependency theory to the study of Latin American international relations is to explain how the development potential of peripheral countries is suppressed and suppressed under the influence of the global division of labor and the capitalist operating mechanism from the outside in. How was national sovereignty negated? The autonomy theory inherited the "center-periphery" structural analysis method of Latin American developmentalism and dependency theory. Its central task is to define the potential of political autonomy and economic autonomy in the internal and external dimensions. And design strategies to effectively and maximize these potentials

Briceño-Ruiz and Simonov believe that although Latin America is a passive recipient of international relations theories in developed regions, it has still developed some local theories with international influence based on its peripheral perspective. Among them, Latin America Developmentalism and dependency theory are the most prominent. The autonomy theory represented by Puig and Jaguariebe, although its influence is relatively low, "can still be regarded as the third major theory of international relations in Latin America." Contribution Coraklei also believes that the autonomy theory's efforts to find solutions for weak countries to reduce vulnerability go beyond the nihilistic dependency theory and the pessimistic conclusions of realism on the ability of weak countries to act autonomously. First Break through the established framework of mainstream Western international relations theory and construct the theory around the core concern of Latin American

countries - autonomy. In the context of realism, power defines interests. The mechanism of power struggle is the same at the individual level and the national level. It's all to control the other party and make the other party submit.

The process of realizing national interests through foreign policy is the process of maintaining, expanding and displaying power. Compared with power, autonomy has never been a concern of the central country. As the shaper of the international system and the maker of international institutions, the central country has sufficient With a large operating space, it can be done in a favorable international system

It is necessary to independently carry out external actions within the context of international relations and the international institutional environment, and pursue its own national interests to the maximum extent. Waltz pointed out that "power is the ability to maintain autonomy in the face of external forces". In other words, autonomy is

“The snowflake is the snowflake is the snowflake 149 199: 1999: 1999”

“The snowflake is the snowflake is the snowflake 149 199: 1999: 1999”

“The snowflake is the snowflake is the snowflake 149 199: 1999: 1999”

The snowflake is the snowflake is the snowflake 149 199: 1999: 1999

Puig believes that there is a directional error because "there is no understanding of the root cause of injustice, that is, the capitalist system itself." Raise doubts"yü

The autonomy theory agrees with the judgment that dependency theory emphasizes that in addition to economic dependence, there are also dependencies in politics, culture, ideology and other fields. However, it clearly opposes the expansion of external factors by dependency theory. Yaguaribe believes that Latin American countries have been in a state of dependence for a long time. An important reason is that domestic elites act as a "transmission belt" for the rule of the central country, intentionally or unintentionally suppressing social change and technological innovation, resulting in a lack of independent capabilities. "The dependence of peripheral countries is not so much imposed by the central country. Rather, it is a choice made by domestic elites in exchange for class benefits."yü Puig emphasized that it is necessary to understand clearly how the structure and operation of international institutions constrain peripheral countries, rather than simply blaming external factors.yü He agreed with "dependence" "Pushing problems to the outside without self-reflection is escaping from reality"yü, and pointed out that the influence of internal factors is also crucial, especially domestic functional elites, who can not only promote and consolidate dependence, but also strive to minimize dependence. He believes that the dependence phenomenon is to a large extent at the actor level rather than at the material level. In other words, the autonomy theory believes that the will, determination and belief of domestic elites have a very important impact on the degree of autonomy of a

country. Thirdly, yü Point out the way out for peripheral countries, and advocate the establishment of comprehensive regional integration with shared values. In response to the problem of the way out for peripheral countries, the autonomy theory proposes that in addition to the options of dependence and revolution, peripheral countries also have a third way—independence. This is because the rule of the central country and the autonomy of peripheral countries are not incompatible. On the contrary, dependent countries can creatively use the maneuvering space provided by the international system to formulate and implement laws and regulations on the basis of meeting a series of domestic necessary conditions. strategic goals that are in line with their own interests. Among them, as the main path to achieve autonomy, regional economic union and policy coordination are indispensable. The autonomy theory advocates the combination of autonomy and integration. It believes that in the capitalist system, facing the challenges from the center Only by implementing a common integration strategy with like-minded countries can peripheral countries strengthen the "domestic feasibility" and "international tolerance" of member states as a whole, promote endogenous development, and improve their international competitiveness. level of bargaining power

yü yüüü yüüüüü yüüüü yüüüüüü yüüüüü: yüüüüüüü yüüüüüüüüüü yüüüüü yüüüüü: yüüüü yüü yüü yüüüüüüüüüüüü yüüüü yüü

yü Nék slimgü "slimís slimébhí y no yüüü"y yü yüü and 12yü yü yüü yüüüü yü yü

yü yüüü yüüüüü yüüüü yüüüüüü yüüüüü: yüüüüüüü yüüüüüüüüüü yüüüüü yüüüüü: yüüüü yüü yüü yüüüüüüüüüüüü yüüüü yüü

yü yüüü yüüü yü yüüüü "yüüüü yü yü yüüüüü yü yü yüüüüü yüüüüü? yüü yüüüüüüüüüüüüü yüüüü yü yüüüüüüüüüüüüüüü yüüüüü yüü yüü yüüü yü yü yüü

