

***"From Democratization to State Reform:
The Missing Link"***

Prof. Terrie R. Groth

Departamento de Ciência Política
Universidade de Brasília
Caixa Postal 04359
Campus Universitário -- Asa Norte
Brasília, DF CEP 70919-970
Tel: (061) 348-2426 FAX: (061) 273-3930
e-mail: tgroth@zaz.com.br

Prepared for delivery at the 1998 meeting of the
Latin American Studies Association,
The Palmer House Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois,
September 24-26, 1998

***DEM 52 Rethinking Approaches to Democratization and State Reform
in Latin America***
(Thursday, 24 September, 08:00)

INTRODUCTION

The present work offers an analytical bibliographical review ¹ interrelating two principal themes and suggesting various directions for future investigation. The discussion is structured in four segments.

The first part briefly characterizes the central thrusts in the international and Brazilian literature around the questions of democratization and state reform and suggests other avenues for clarifying the debates. The second part analyzes the conceptual binomial of state and reform; a brief exposition of the paradigms organizing the theories of the contemporary state is offered. The third part analyzes the binomial reform and democracy; a brief exposition of the paradigms organizing the theories of contemporary democracy is offered. The fourth part links the discussion on reform of the state with the more general conceptual crisis of political science.

The paper concludes pointing up the significance of the theoretical divergences around state and class and democratization as a means of advancing the debates surrounding reform. The transition between democratization studies and the apparently new obsession with reform of the state has gone largely unacknowledged and unexplored by comparative political theory. State reform is identified as the latest incarnation of the "re-democratization" thematic, replete with the errors and limitations of the theories of authoritarianism and democratization.

DEMOCRATIZATION AS STATE REFORM

Three Assertions

To begin, we suggest three premisses to mold inquiry into the questions of democratization and reform of the state into more productive forms.

First, the reform of the state is a sub-theme best inserted in the larger debate over the nature of "re-democratization" and democracy in Latin America and other regions. In order to appreciate the strengths and weaknesses in the visions of the current democratic period, it is necessary to recuperate interpretations of the state in the authoritarian period.

In this sense, an analysis of state reform needs to support itself upon an examination of corporatism and authoritarian forms (Diniz 1996, 11-39 and Malloy 1993 and Malloy and Kaufman 1993; See review by Aradjo and Tapia 1992 and the fundamental contributions of Linz 1980, 1978, Malloy 1977, Linz and Stepan 1978, and Collier 1982). Since the 1970s, corporatism became the dominant framework of the North American political science community for the study of state-civil society relations. More than a regime typology, corporatism must also be understood as a mode of analysis of Latin American politics in general, a vision held to be applicable to both pre- and post-authoritarian societies. Variants of corporatist analysis structured later interpretations of democratization. The historical-cultural variant (Howard Wiarda, Frederick Pike, Riordan Roett), positing a strong connection between colonial and modern forms of political organization, identified the

¹ Many English-language sources are cited to references in Portuguese owing to previous versions of this paper. I apologize to the reader for this possible annoyance.

"Ibero-American tradition" as the source of twentieth century authoritarianism. The structural-functional variant (Philippe Schmitter, Chalmers Johnson, Ronald Newton) linked authoritarian state structures to the demands of capitalist development.

The neo-corporatist variant is of special significance and is associated with the initial contribution of Guillermo O'Donnell (1973, 1980; 1987a and b; 1973, 1981a and b) in the form of the model of the bureaucratic-authoritarian state (B-A) (see also Canak 1984 and the related work of Schmitter, Juan Linz, David Collier and others). The original objective of the B-A causal model was to describe the economic and political influences giving rise to a peculiar state form in Latin America. The general lines of argument established by O'Donnell in 1973 and subsequently refined over the ensuing ten years structures both the examination of military dictatorships and democratic transitions.

Also of relevance in the same period are analyses of the impact of fiscal crises on the authoritarian state (Felix 1986; Hartlyn and Morley 1986; Richards 1985, 1986; Roett 1985) and beyond (O'Donnell 1988a and b, 1990; Stepan 1985; Acuña and Smith 1994). O'Donnell continues to be a key player as the question of democracy is carried into the state reform era (1991, 1993, 1996).

There is also an extensive literature which treats the collective process of "re-democratization" in all of its facets in Latin America (Wiarda 1980; O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead 1986, see the critical literature represented by Nef 1988 and MacEwan 1988; for treatments similar to O'Donnell, Malloy and Seligson 1987; Diamond, Linz and Lipset 1989; Cavarozzi and Garretón 1988). In general, the mainstream treatment of transitions focuses on the peculiarities of each case, the structuring of interests and democratic "rules of the game," the formation of democratic coalitions, and the rational choice identification of post-authoritarian alternatives. Those following O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead represent a retreat from structural explanations while demonstrating an essential acceptance and continuity with the B-A model.

More recently, we witness a series of collective treatments viewing the Latin American experience in comparative perspective (Ethier 1990; Linz and Stepan 1993; Mainwaring, O'Donnell and Valenzuela 1992; Mainwaring and Scully (1995). Other collections offer a more critical orientation to the transition process (Lopez and Stohl 1987; Silva-Michelena 1988; Rueschemeyer et.al. 1992; Haggard and Kaufman 1995) as well as rare and entirely alternative perspectives on state reform (Cunill Grau 1997).

Second, the discussion of reform of the state has clear repercussions in the Brazilian literature (Arretche 1995, Abrucio 1998), the key Latin American case of state reform. Deserving of special examination in the national literature is the line of inquiry developed by the ex-Minister of Federal Administration and State Reform Luiz Carlos Bresser Pereira, especially in relation to his international referents (Osborne and Gaebler 1994, Ketl 1994, Ketl and Dilulio 1994). In spite of a demonstrated consistent theoretical density over the last two decades, there has never been a systematic attempt to evaluate the body of his work on its own terms or in relation to prevailing tendencies in political science. From early on, Bresser Pereira focused on a series of interrelated themes culminating in his most recent work (1996, 1997b): strategic actors (1972, 1974), class interests and state policy (1978, 1981b), economic policy and the contours of the capitalist state in general and in Brazil (1981a, 1984, 1986, 1993a and b), and the process of "re-democratization" (1985, 1990, 1992). A rare critical voice of Bresser Pereira and state reform in Brazil is dos Santos (1997).

These works and their preoccupations have already manifested an international impact (Bresser Pereira and Spink 1998; Bresser Pereira 1997a and c; Bresser Pereira, Przeworski and Maravall 1993, 1996; Przeworski 1994, 1995; MARE/BID/ONU 1996) as well as national reflections (Beltrno 1984, Holanda 1993, GouvLa 1994, Sola 1993, Diniz 1996, Diniz and Azevedo 1997).

Third, reform of the state must be related to both international and local conceptions of the contemporary state. In fact, the question of state reform raises the very notion of the state and the necessity for a theoretical revision (Mitchell 1991, Lowy 1992, Almond 1991). In specific question is the dominant pluralist notion of the state and democracy (Lindblom 1977, 1981; Dahl 1990, 1993, 1978, 1971, 1982) and its relation to the neo-liberal orientation to public policies (Silva 1994; Toldeo 1995; see Borón 1994 and Sader and Gentili 1995 for a critical analysis).

Two Paradigms

This latter observation may represent an identifiable tendency to understand the state in the context of other issues in the field of comparative politics (Chilcote and Chilcote 1991; Chilcote (1988/1991, 1990b, 1995; Azais and Cappellin 1993).

An examination of the contours of the principal literature would easily recognize two directions in the discipline of political science: one orthodox (of liberal behaviorist orientation) and the other radical (of an historicist/marxist and post-behavioral nature). A critical reconstruction of these two competitive paradigms remains essential to sorting out the current analytical impasses of political science (Groth 1997b) as suggested below.

Figure A summarizes our understanding of the fundamental paradigmatic contrasts which condition the discussion of the reform of the state. Broadly speaking, dominant political science still maintains a behaviorialist methodological vision committed to a liberal tradition and restricted to presupposing a capitalist society as the horizon of its analyses. A possible alternative political science maintains a post-behaviorialist methodological vision committed to a radical or marxist tradition, open to imagining a society which may supercede capitalism.

FIGURE A***PARADIGMATIC PARAMETERS OF THE ANALYSIS OF REFORM OF THE STATE***

	DOMINANT POLITICAL SCIENCE	ALTERNATIVE POLITICAL SCIENCE
METHODOLOGY	Fragmented and subjective; Quantitative and ahistorical; Liberal/orthodox paradigm? Dominant political science? Normative Philosophy Positivism Behavioralism Post-modernism (Neo-weberianism?)	Holistic, objective and subjective; Historical, quantitative e qualitative; Marxist/radical paradigm? Alternative political science? Historicism Marxism Post-behavioralism Post-marxism (Neo-marxism?)
GENERAL VISION OF SOCIETY	Category of individuals owns the means of production (factories, machinery, etc.), employs another category of individuals that owns nothing more than their own labor power and enters into production and sales to generate private profits and accumulate private property	Productive category collectively owns the means of production and enters into production mainly to satisfy human needs and generate social (and perhaps private) profits and accumulate varied forms of property

Couching the question of state reform in paradigmatic perspective permits us to examine and elucidate two relevant conceptual binomials: state and reform; reform and democracy. We observe how the adoption of certain definitions and premises about the state and democracy lead the political scientist to confuse or clarify the state-society-market relationship. In the final substantive section of the paper, we attempt to explain why the field has taken a turn away from the issues of state and democracy and what could be done to reverse this trend.

STATE & REFORM: GROUPS vs. CLASSES

The running treatment in the literature on reform follows the liberal formulation in which the state appears in its ideal form as a neutral instrument of the political community and in practice as the sum of group pressures emanating from organized society. We call this formulation "state-as-artifact" because the state is understood as an object or a collection of visible political institutions separated from civil society. The conception of the state in alternative political science is associated with various marxist schools of political analysis, but seen always as a reflection of the social structure and the productive scheme which gives rise to them both. We call this formulation "state-as relation" because the state is understood in relation to objective interests and subjective struggles among classes.

State-as-Artifact

The dominant notions of the state can be distinguished in two groups: interpretations favoring either a "passive" or an "active" state. The "passive state", aligned with the tradition of limited government, represents a confused collection of preoccupations related to the "problem of big

government" or "statism" which does not manage to make explicit a coherent theory of the state. One variant of this emphasis we might call "free-market conservatism" (emphasizing the doctrine of *laissez-faire* and complaining of the involvement of the state in the market along the lines of Hayek (1982, 1987), Friedman (1962; Friedman and Friedman 1979) and Buchanan (1975). "Neo-liberalism" reifies this vision of the minimalist state, attempting to internationalize distorted central concepts of classical liberalism as a guide to the formulation and implementation of public policies. Perhaps the most abstract expression of the passive state in contemporary political science had its heyday in the 1960s and 70s in the form of systems theory (see Young 1970 for a summary of this effort; David Easton 1968, 1970a and b, 1982 and Gabriel Almond and his collaborators in Almond 1970, Almond and Powell 1979, 1980).

The "active state", associated with the practice of government of the New Deal in the U.S. and other experiences, stands as the principal counterpoint to free-market conservatism. Its central variant we might call "reformist liberalism", giving emphasis on the use of the state to better the general welfare of political community as the best means of balancing the abuses of the market system while preserving private property and individual liberties. Beyond this vision of the state as the mechanism to preserve and humanize the capitalist economy we might add the more extreme forms of the activist state (e.g., corporatism, authoritarianism and totalitarianism).

State-as-Relation

Generally speaking, the characterization of the state-as- relation views the state as an instrument through which a ruling class protects and advances its interests. In this sense, the state is not merely a "necessary evil" (as in the liberal vision), but an absolutely indispensable instrument of class domination, protecting the unequal distribution of property and benefits and advancing the general interests of the owners of the productive system. The antagonism or fundamental tension at the heart of class societies is expressed in the real world as the domination of the owners of the means of production over society as a whole. With reference to capitalist society, there are three spheres or levels of domination: economic, ideological and political.

In the marxist vision, the state is an aspect of class relations, expressing the basic class tensions of society and at the same time acting as an instrument to brake class struggle. The state disguises its role of political domination through a discourse of "general interest" and mutable forms of regimes (e.g., the liberal representative).

The alternative notions of the state may be discriminated around the characterization of two objects: the capitalist and the socialist state . Inspired by diverse readings of the works of Marx, Hegel, Lenin and Gramsci, contemporary marxists have traced numerous understandings of the nature of the capitalist state.

"Instrumentalism, viewing the capitalist state as the instrument of a dominant or ruling class, maintains a focus on this class and its linkages to the formulation and implementation of public policies. This more British or North American variant is represented in the prevailing literature by the work of Ralph Miliband (1972, 1979a and b, 1983a and b) and G. William Domhoff (1970, 1978). Paul Baran (1942) also saw the state as an instrument in the hands of a ruling class.

"Structuralism", viewing the state as organizer and unifier of ruling class interests, maintains a focus on the resolution of economic contradictions and crises. In this interpretation, the functions of the capitalist state are widely determined by the structures of society, not the individuals occupying

positions of state power. Structuralism proposes to examine the limits and contradictions of capitalism from within the structure where the state is situated. This more French variant of marxist state theory is represented principally by the works of Nicos Poulantzas (1977 a and b, 1978, 1979 a and b, 1981, 1982). The American marxists Baran and Paul Sweezy (1966) emphasized the economic side of structuralism, noting the role of the state in the resolution of economic contradictions through attempts to avoid the crises inherent to monopoly capitalism.

"Criticalism" offers a focus on the mystification of the capitalist state and the propagation of the ideology of false consciousness, as well as the obfuscation of class struggle and the nature of public policies. Representative authors include thinkers associated with the Frankfurt School (Freitag 1986, Freitag and Rouanet 1980; Habermas 1980, 1982; Jay 1989, Schroyer 1973, Slater 1977).

"Statism" locates the state within the dialectical relationship between domination and its systemic limits, noting how social structures condition class struggles and state policies, thus examining the content of class struggles as well as the structures and policies of the state. Representative authors include James O'Connor (1977, 1984) who focused on the profit crises of corporations and the bankruptcy of the state in order to show the relation between internal state structures and the accumulation process and class struggles. Claus Offe (1975, 1979, 1984a, b and c, 1989) criticized both instrumentalists and structuralists for ignoring the mechanisms which reflect the class nature of the state and its structure, ideology, processes and repression.

Among the alternative notions it is also possible to include a reading of the forms of the socialist state, distinguishing between visions of classes under socialism, the road to a socialist transition (in terms of political strategy and the reorganization of the economy), and the role of political democracy. "Statist" or "bureaucratic socialism" did not recognize classes under socialism (following its criticism of capitalist class society), presuming an effective abolition of classes through the collective ownership of the means of production. The transition would necessarily be revolutionary, utilizing the state as the arm of a new class that dominates the economy (acting under the tutelage of a vanguard party). This strategic perspective of "reform of the state" is essentially the script for the state collectivism of the Russian Revolution which also favored central economic planning. The historical result was the usurpation of democratic politics with the dictatorship of the proletariat substituted by the dictatorship of the party.

"Democratic" or "revolutionary socialism" admits that classes continue to exist under socialism owing to the complexity of the process of abolishing private property. Thus, the implantation of socialism implies not only the socialization of the means of production, but also the transformation of the social relations of production. Such a transition would eventually be revolutionary in the sense that class relations are fundamentally changed. The strategic perspective for the transition would be more evolutionary in character and the organization of the economy could be based in part on the mechanism of the market, defining and refining roles and levels of central planning. Without separating ends and means, socialism in this perspective must be reached through democratic means with participatory experiences within the law eventually producing the conditions to contest economic autocracy and bourgeois political culture. Democratic politics is seen as an essential instrument in the construction of socialism, since democratic forms aid workers in controlling a bureaucratic elite, restrict attempts to accumulate personal power, guarantee pacific successions to power, and resolve the objective conflicts of interests within socialism.

Figure B translates our understanding of the contrasting notions of the state in relation to "reform". Broadly considered, dominant political science with its vision of state-as-artifact confounds the state with its more mutable form as regime, thus reducing the discussion of state reform to a

restricted technical field defined principally by the impulses of the market. A possible alternative political science with its vision of state-as-relation understands the state as a function of class structure and places the discussion of state reform in the field of contestation of socio-political domination.

FIGURE B

PERSEPECTIVES ON THE STATE & IMPLICATIONS FOR STATE REFORM

	DOMINANT POLITICAL SCIENCE	ALTERNATIVE POLITICAL SCIENCE
STATE	Group or community instrument Passive State Free-market Conservatism PolRtical System Neo-Liberalism Active State Reformist Liberalism Corporatism Authoritarianism	Related to social classes Capitalist State Instrumentalism Structuralism Criticalism Statism Socialist State Statist/Bureaucratic Democratic/Revolutionary Totalitarianism
NATURE OF REFORM	Impeled by the market, with or without state planning, but in the general context of private capitalist planing Aimed at serving interests and imperatives of capital (efficiency) Administrative reform; political engineering	Impeled by the state and class struggles, markets regulated with state planning Aimed at serving popular interests and the construction of socialism (efficacy) Contestation and political revolution

The critical contrast which emerges from the analysis of the state-reform binomial is that of a state composed of and a reform carried out either by groups or social classes. These conceptions carry meanings of actors and interests that are fundamentally opposite (Balbus 1971, Cunningham 1975-76). In the dominant acritical view of state reform, markets are automatically presumed to be superior to the state as the principal mechanism for social and economic organization. This is not to suggest that reform of the state is a random, chaotic process. On the contrary, modifications of state institutions and regulations are driven by an abiding respect for the ideal of efficiency (understood as responsiveness to private capital and organized private interests). State reform is thus administrative reform with the state understood as visible governmental institutions and regime types. "Political engineering" from above is the best means for making "the state" compatible with market signals emitted from society. In an alternative contestant view of state reform, markets are best subjected to the state which reflects the constellation of class forces in society. Alterations in the state-society relationship are structured by the principle of efficacy (understood as responsiveness to broader social interests in the pursuit of democracy and social justice). State reform is thus a contested process with the state understood as an expression of conflictive class interests. "Political revolution" from below is

the best means for making the state compatible with popular classes interested in transforming market society.

REFORM & DEMOCRACY: PLURALIST vs. POPULAR

The prevailing treatment (although quite indirect) of democracy in the literature on reform of the state also reflects the liberal formulation in which democracy appears in its ideal form as classical participation (as idealized in antiquity) and in practice as liberal representation. We call this formulation "democracy-as-process" because democracy is understood principally as a collection of rules restricted to governing the relationship between political rulers and citizens who are ruled. The conception of democracy in an alternative political science is inspired by marxist analytical notions, although the socialist practice takes many forms. We call this formulation "democracy-as-result" because democracy is understood not only in relation to juridical guarantees of political equality but also in terms of substantive conditions of equality as the desired end of the process.

Democracy-as-Process

In our times, democracy has been defined mostly in terms of elections, representation, and civil liberties. In its oldest and more fundamental sense, democracy has meant the organization of political society in such a way as to guarantee the direct participation of the citizens in their own governance; common people acting publicly to affect the direction of collective life. This vision of classical participation gives way in the modern period to more restricted conceptions of democracy.

In the vision of liberal representation common since the last century, participation becomes indirect and politics is seen not as a process of deliberation but as a means of establishing instruments through which citizens exercise indirect control over their governors. This necessarily implies the separation of rulers and ruled, i.e., the people govern indirectly through representatives authorized to make decisions in their name. Citizen participation is limited basically to periodic elections. This model responds to the demands of industrial mass society, although recognizing the potential problems that intermittent participation may create as well as the problem of maintaining private space in the face of public encroachment.

Arising from the empirical research of behavioral political science, the pluralist revision of democratic theory seeks a description of democracy supposedly more consistent with contemporary political life. Maintaining the U.S. political system as an article of faith, authors like Joseph Schumpeter (1984), Robert Dahl (1958, 1961, 1989) and Seymour Martin Lipset (1966, 1967; see also Bachrach 1967) emphasized the functional necessity of apathy, the role of political elites in a democracy, equated popular apathy with political satisfaction, and defended competition among elites as a guarantee against the formation of rigid oligarchies in contemporary democracies.

Social democracy, in spite of the label, locates itself within the line of thinking of democracy-as-process due to its presumption of pluralist democracy. The institutions of liberal representation are accepted (e.g., representation through the formation of groups, participation in elections, etc.) along with the possibility of developing additional forms of participation (e.g., plebiscite, referendum, democratic experiences in the workplace, etc.). Although a strong working class movement may exist, the capitalist class maintains dominance of the political system which implies acceptance of the capitalist mode of production along its general lines. Following the corporatist mode of representation, social reform of capitalism is made possible through a welfare state which provides certain social and economic guarantees for the working class without altering in any significant way the distribution of

political power between classes in society.

Democracy-as-Result

With roots in marxist political analysis and its critique of capitalism, democracy-as-result suggests that political power arises from the control of the economic system and politics is seen as conflict over public priorities, choosing certain values, interests and ends and excluding others. In this perspective, politics involves not only competition among groups within the system, but also struggles to change the system entirely. Thus, the notion of the political process includes not only the desire to achieve certain predefined ends, but also the struggle to redefine the ends of the system and propose alternatives.

This vision of democracy contained in the notion of class struggle posits a fusion of the political and the economic since politics is generally an extension of the struggles which deal with questions of material survival, human welfare, in sum, the essential conditions of social life. Democracy is thus seen not only as a collection of political procedures, but also as a system which ought to provide substantive results for the public in general. These advances and democracy itself are represented by the struggles for these substantive benefits on the part of democratic forces (e.g., workers, consumers, community groups, etc.). These economic struggles inherently imply political struggles to democratize "the rules of the game" (e.g., the right to vote, to assemble, to redress grievances to the government, etc.). Seen in this way, the true history of democracy might be represented by a series of events typically downplayed in liberal analysis (e.g., strikes, mass movements, boycotts, etc.).

In practice, the concrete socialist experience produced various expressions of this general definition of democracy. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" is perhaps the most widely recognized, with its emphasis on a revolutionary transition to socialism, inverting the class domination in capitalist society and understanding democracy as "democratic centralism." "Popular hegemony," a concept constructed in the Sandinista Revolution in Nicaragua, presumes socialism as the definition of a just society, desires that popular classes achieve hegemony through organizational pluralism, and values the political participation of all classes obeying the "logic of the majority." From the writings of Marx himself there remains a portrait of "democratic socialism" emphasizing redistributive justice and the construction of a new socialist political economy, the eventual extinction of the dominant classes and private property, and the democratization of life in general.

Figure C illustrates our understanding of the contrasting notions of democracy in relation to "reform of the state." Generally, dominant political science with its vision of democracy-as-process, carrying a vision of a state as a product of pressure groups, privileges a process of reform restricted to "strategic actors" associated with the regime and others who retain political power. A possible alternative political science with its vision of democracy-as-result, conceiving the state as the expression of class forces, posits the possibility of the participation of actors traditionally excluded by the state in its reformulation.

FIGURE C***PERSPECTIVES OF DEMOCRACY & IMPLICATIONS FOR STATE REFORM***

	DOMINANT POLITICAL SCIENCE	ALTERNATIVE POLITICAL SCIENCE
DEMOCRACY	Political organization in which certain rights and liberties exist and are guaranteed principally by the state Classical Participation Liberal Representation Pluralism Social Democracy	Social organization in which certain rights and liberties exist and are guaranteed jointly by the state and civil society Class Struggle Dictatorship of the Proletariat Popular Hegemony Democratic Socialism
NATURE OF REFORM	Concentrated in the hands of state authorities, powerful autonomous interest groups Pluralist democracy, with political rights separated from social Capitalist class hegemonic; popular influences indirect and minimized	Involving the bureaucracy and mass organizations Popular democracy, with political and social rights interdependent Popular classes hegemonic; both direct and indirect popular participation valued

The crucial contrast which emerges from the analysis of the reform-democracy binomial is that of a democracy characterized by and a reform undertaken with more or less dispersion of political power; more or less inclusion of exclusion of non-state actors. These conceptions also carry obviously contrary meanings. In the predominant view of contemporary political science, state reform is a matter for the state itself. The process of administrative reform and political engineering is necessarily restricted to key bureaucratic actors and invited elites from civil society. Such a perspective is consistent with pluralism which narrows democracy to a political sphere and prefers popular non-involvement in public policy. In the minority view of alternative political science, state reform might extrapolate the goals of orthodox theory. The process of altering the composition of the state involves expanding the definition of democracy to include new actors and new forms of participation in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policy.

THE MISSING LINK AS OBSTACLE

The transition between democratization studies and an apparently new obsession with reform of the state has gone largely unacknowledged and unexplored by comparative political theory. The B-A model and subsequent formulations focus on equilibrium, not conflict and change. This subtle bias is transmitted in turn to "democratization studies" and generates models that emphasize the control of social cleavages, not the quality and direction of power relations during the re-democratization process. Thus, class struggle, inequality, exploitation and injustice become secondary concepts in analyses of democratization (and of state reform) as they maintain their primary focus on official actors and their politicking.

The inadequate paradigm of democracy inherent in the theories of authoritarian regimes extends itself to the understanding of democratic transitions. Indeed, orthodox theoreticians were not only dealing poorly with democracy during the beginning of the 1980s but even appeared to be abandoning Latin America as their field of interest. They return in the 1990s eager to reform the state, the only arena that remains open to their previous definitions of democracy.

Democratization as the New Authoritarianism

The failure to follow the trail of this inheritance dooms Latin Americanists to repeat the omissions of orthodox democratization theory and narrows discussions of "reform" to a caricature of the state. We must take responsibility for resolving our theoretical condition and begin constructing a new agenda around themes that contest orthodox analytical hegemony.

We outline here two broad lines of inquiry, reminding of the dominant and briefly characterizing the critical literature associated with each, which might form the basis for such an agenda.

State and Class. As noted at the outset, from the 1970s onward, radical conceptions of state and class were supplanted by the corporatist and bureaucratic-authoritarian (B-A) models of state-society relations in Latin America.

Comprehensive, penetrating criticism of this significant body of work has been rare. Gabriel Almond (1983) correctly noted the continuities between pluralism and corporatism as did Ciria (1978). Borón (1979) offered alternative conceptions of the state. Canak (1984) crafted a very useful critical synthesis of bureaucratic-authoritarianism. To my knowledge the only one direct attack on the B-A model on its own terms was launched by Remmer and Merckx (1982; with reply by O'Donnell 1982).

A related strain of literature currently undergoing a revival is the "military institution." Eclipsed by the B-A formulation during the heyday of the dictatorships, the focus on the military returned in the "re-democratization" period and is beginning to occupy an intermediary position in the literature on the state and democratization. O'Donnell (1981c) also contributes here as well as Stepan (1971, 1973b, 1988). Most recent efforts cluster around case studies (Philip 1985, Remmer 1989, Wesson 1986) and cross-regional comparisons ("Back ..." 1985, Goodman et.al. 1990, Welch 1987). Ames (1988) reviews some of these contributions.

Throughout this period, there have also been some interesting exceptions to fundamentally mainstream treatments of the military. Caviedes (1984) and Rouquié (1987) develop broad, synthetic treatments of militarism while Woddis (1977) is probably the only explicitly marxist treatment of the theme. Black (1986) reminds us of the imperial context of military involvement in politics. O'Brien and Cammack (1985) analyze the military retreat from power as do Handelman and Sanders (1981) who also undertake a significant structural critique of O'Donnell. Varas (1989) is a more recent work which raises the question of the persistence of military power.

While these treatments represent nuances on the themes of the military, the state, and democracy, taken together they do not constitute a structured challenge redirecting attention to issues of state and class. To begin this journey, we ought to explicitly resurrect discussion of the capitalist state both in the context of its dominated form and the larger framework of the contemporary international nature of the mode of production. Additionally, a related focus on class remains essential

and there is evidence to suggest that class analysis may be sensitively conducted, avoiding both the criticisms and pitfall of post-marxism. Finally, it would be appropriate to return our attention to the themes of hegemony and domination as a specific avenue of inquiry in the area of state and class (Petras 1987).

Democratic Futures. An insistence on state and class as a key aspect of an alternative research agenda also carries the demand to present an alternative analysis of democratization. While the radical record has been better on this point, the agenda as a whole remains fixed on narrower interpretations.

The same scholars responsible for our notions of authoritarianism set the limits for discussing "democratic transitions" and now, not surprisingly, set the tone for state reform. O'Donnell recognized the need to incorporate the prospect of re-democratization into the B-A model for some time and remains an instrumental figure in organizing cross-national research on the question. Stepan gives the appearance of discussing state and class forces while essentially appropriating marxist terminology. Others have included more interesting interpretations of democratization, but uneven collections of orthodox content prevail (Eidlin 1983, Herz 1978, 1982, Balroya 1987). In general, these analyses emphasize case-by-case idiosyncracies and the key role of elite actors and state leaders in driving re-democratization. Other works tend to narrow their intentions to the question of elections (Drake and Silva 1986, Remmer 1985) or deal with democracy in a more diffuse, highly generalized fashion (Needler 1987, Wesson 1982, 1988, Wiarda 1980).

There have also been some recent collective attempts by Latin American authors (Orrego Vicuña 1985, Gutiérrez and dos Santos 1987) which have not seemed to attract much attention. As in the case of the military's retreat from power, comparative treatments are becoming more common ("Succession ..." 1988, Orme 1988, Pastor 1989), but other general monographic work focuses on typification (Chalmers and Robinson 1982, Share 1987, Chaffee 1984).

Critical theoretical reviews of the democratization theme begin to emerge as evidenced by Therborn (1979), Cammack (1986), and Garretón (1986). Gillespie (1987) and MacEwan (1988) considered the O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead project specifically. Edel (1987) touched on the question of elections and Silva-Michelena (1988) on the relationship between democratization and debt. Two observers in particular have done much to advance a left analysis of democratization: Jorge Nef (1983 a and b, 1986, 1988) and James Petras (1986, Herman and Petras 1985). Important left journals have also pushed for more incisive analyses of the future of democracy in Latin America ("Dialectics ..." 1986, "Democratization ..." 1990).

A rigorous left analysis of democratization has yet to take shape. Petras (1979), Roberts (1985), and Barros (1986) provide some early guidance in this direction. Most recently radicals began searching for ways to connect the democratization question with issues of state and class theory (Harding and Petras 1988, Petras 1988, Chilcote 1988) and insisting on a discussion of democracy and socialism in Latin America (Harris 1988, Vasconi 1990, Munck 1990). Comparative work would also be in order (Fagen et.al. 1986, Cumings 1989). A major effort should be undertaken to produce a theoretically coherent and broadly documented refutation of Transitions from Authoritarian Rule and its successors. We have a few fine collections and texts that suggest a movement in this direction, but we need to press ahead (Archetti et.al. 1987, Petras et.al. 1986, Cockcroft 1989). Such a major contribution is vital to establishing and distinguishing a new radical agenda. Related to this major project, expanded attention to the theme of state reform would also provide a means of expanding the radical agenda.

State Reform. As the bulk of this paper suggests, the state reform "fad" could also benefit from a paradigmatic resorting of state, class and democracy. At the very least, a critique of the state reform literature could begin with the recognition of the two polar positions regarding "democratic transitions". The dominant or liberal position clearly provides the nest for state reform. Through a civil-military negotiated transition, there is a return to civil liberties, the promulgation of a new constitution, more parties and electoral competition, regular and pacific elections, in sum, a new consensus about the "rules of the game" (parliamentary democracy?). The threat in the transitional stage comes from the rising expectations and uncontrolled popular mobilization which might provoke a new coup.

The alternative or popular notion of democratization imagines a transition linked to a particular socio-economic vision in which substantive results for the excluded, needy population are produced. The possibility of a transition to socialism is apparent. Thus, an analysis of hegemony and domination perceives an historical and institutional continuity between military dictatorship and civilian government. Real democratization is conceived not as a transition between forms of regime, but as the transformation of the state and the scheme of property and production which underlies it.

As liberal analysis confuses regime changes with democratic transitions, so too does it confound the notion of state reform along the lines sketched above (state and reform; reform and democracy). Distinguishing state from regime allows us to move beyond the authoritarian vs. democratic false dichotomy. If we continue to view the state as regime (the mutable forms of government subject to the medium-term wills of groups and classes and related only to public decision-making), then we will never arrive at a true discussion of state reform. If we shift to a view of the state as the more permanent collection of class-based institutions exercising coercion over society, then we realize that mainstream political science is not discussing the state (or its reform) at all.

New Elitism and Reform of the State

Why has political science marched steadfastly away from a more penetrating, structural notion of reform of the state?

The disconnections between democracy, the state, and reform perceived in the current literature in fact demonstrates a theoretical problem of a higher order: the conceptual limits imposed by the actual paradigmatic crisis in political science. Beyond the increasing lack of fields of reference, the "crisis of paradigms" affecting all of the social sciences and humanities over the last ten years has led political science to a series of theoretical and methodological impasses.

The current paradigmatic impasse in political science has not produced a climate open to more critical analyses nor to freer competition of ideas. On the contrary, political science clings to its previous dominant models while potential critics isolate themselves in a "radical malaise" (seen as the incapacity to define and implement an alternative agenda for research and action). This ill-feeling would be related to two interdependent and sequential crises: that of the paradigms and that of "existing socialisms" (Groth 1991, 2). The impact of these crises in Latin American studies has been three-fold: 1) the proliferation of the ideology of liberal analysis; 2) the cooptation and transformation of a range of concepts previously seen as alternative, and 3) the popularity of neo- and post-marxisms (Groth 1991, 3-7; Chilcote 1990a, Munck 1990).

Thus what reigns is a species of new elitism as the only means of avoiding an examination of

long-term structural change. The new elitism substitutes the discussion of class formation and consciousness with "individuals" or "rational actors". The structural problems of capitalism are reduced to issues of public policy, "political engineering," "governability," or "reform of the state". Emphasizing the autonomy of the political and discarding any discussion of production (the notion of exploitation now relegated to the sphere of distribution). Methodological individualism reinforces the fragmentation of knowledge, reconciling neo-classical economics, political pluralism, and micro-sociology. In the world of the "rational chooser" populated by individuals without social identity, there is no class struggle because there are no classes; directed political and social "action" is substituted by neutral "behavior".

Not surprisingly, we return to the classical elitism of the end of the last century. The "Paretian legacy" serves the function today that it did in the 1930s: to provide a bourgeois response to Marx (Mello e Souza 1985), to offer a patina of scientism and paper over the lack of confidence of intellectuals in their own explanations. As with Pareto, "analytical marxism," game theory, and models of rational choice seek to rationalize actions which seem to be non-logical, thus complementing an economic analysis of political behavior with sociological and psychological abstractions.

This tendency weds itself very well to a second methodological mark of our era: post-modernism, with its mixture of paradigms carrying a disapproving attitude of marxism and, in fact, of any structural explanation for politics. Thus, the fragmentation of civil society is repackaged as "individual preferences," the emergence of the service sector is described as a sign of a "post-industrial economy," the supposed decline of the working class movement is used to question the very existence of classes. Another series of results includes the inability to theorize about transformations in the structure of global capitalism (from industrial to speculative). The capitalist pillage of the state in the northern hemisphere and in Latin America in the form of accelerated privatizations does not collide with market-centered premisses; the degradation of labor based on the decline of purchasing power does not contradict a focus on "distribution". There are no classes because there is no readily visible class struggle. A plurality of "social groupings" and randomized individuals emerge as a replacement for "society". The forces determining the "democratic rules" fragmenting the organization and conscientization of class and defining the contours of the public agenda are left without examination. Political action is equated with consensual behavior.

The post-behavioral political myth that science and ideology have presently been balanced is useful in that it disguises a fundamentally unchanged reality: liberal dominance of the academy and the hegemonic project of international capital in Latin America. While radical Latin Americanists busied themselves founding important new journals, organizations, and institutes, the behavioral juggernaut ground ahead. The result is that important theoretical gains of the 1970s stagnated in the 1980s. If the 1970s was the decade of paradigms, then the 1980s did not witness the refinement of a radical paradigm or research agenda. For all of our scholarly activity and political criticism, radical theoretical concepts and concerns were slowly coopted and reformulated by liberal scholars unable or uninterested in adopting new modes of analysis. The question of the state became subsumed by discussions of corporatism and bureaucratic-authoritarianism, classes by a focus on "new" social movements, dependency by notions of world-system and liberal political economy, and the prospect of an anti-capitalist transition replaced by the expectation of "re-democratization." "Reform of the state" any conception of democracy beyond pluralism and banalizes or pollutes the very notion of the state.

CONCLUSION

A number of general preoccupations were identified initially in this paper, with special attention

given to the predominant interpretations of the origins and delimitations of the reform of the state. The treatment of the question of democracy in the literature on state reform provides the principal avenue for a critical re-analysis.

Two contrasting visions of the state were presented, offering divergent understandings of the notion of reform. The vision of "state-as-artifact" associates (and confuses) the state with regime or government, thus producing an interpretation of reform as a preeminently technical process linked to the dynamic of the market. The vision of "state-as-relation" characterizes the state in relation to the social structure, thus suggesting an interpretation of reform as a process of rearticulation of hegemony or domination.

Two contrasting visions of democracy were presented, offering divergent understandings of the state and its reform. The vision of "democracy-as-process" (associated with the state-artifact) entertains an elitist route to the reform of the state. The vision of "democracy-as-result" (associated with the state-relation) opens the alternative of a popular route to the reform of the state.

In the face of this analysis it is crucial to perceive that reform of the state and democratic consolidation need not configure a problematic relationship. But it is also necessary to recognize the fact that in order to offer better conditions for the functioning of the market (at the same time as developing wider democratic mechanisms) modification of existing political and economic institutions is necessary, i.e., the creation of institutions capable of creating a relation of interdependence (and not subordination) between state, society, and market.

For the time being, unfortunately, contemporary political science seems determined to ban the four issues which have contributed the most to its vitality over the last 150 years: the state, social structure, democracy, and capitalism. And all of this at a time when a reexamination of these issues were never more critical to citizens' future.

REFERENCES

Abrucio, Fernando Luiz

1998 "Os avanços e os dilemas do modelo pós-burocrático: a reforma da administração pública à luz da experiência internacional recente," págs. 173-199 em Luiz Carlos Bresser Pereira e Peter Spink (orgs.), Reforma do Estado e Administração Pública Gerencial. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

Acuña, C., e William Smith

1994 "The Political Economy of Structural Adjustment: The Logic of Support and Opposition to Neoliberal Reform," em W. Smith, C. Acuña e E. Gamarra (orgs.), Latin American Political Economy in the Age of Neoliberal Reform, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction/Miami: North-South Center.

Almond, Gabriel

1970 "Sistemas Políticas Comparadas," págs. 43-57 em Maria Stella de Amorim, (org.), Sociologia Política II, Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

1983 "Corporatism, Pluralism, and Professional Memory," World Politics 35 (January), 245-260.

1991 "Capitalism and Democracy," PS: Political Science & Politics 24 (September), 467-474.

-----, e G. Bingham Powell, jr.

1979 "O Sistema Político," págs. 28-42 em Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Carlos Estevam Martins (orgs.), Política e Sociedade, Volume I, São Paulo: Editora Nacional. (Da introdução de Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, Boston: Little, Brown, 1966).

1980 Uma Teoria de Política Comparada, 2ª edição. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Comparative Politics: A

- Developmental Approach, Boston: Little, Brown, 1966).
- Ames, Barry
1988 "Military and Society in Latin America," (review article) Latin American Research Review 23 (no 2), 157-169.
- Aradjo, Angela M.C., e Jorge R.B. Tapia
1991 "Corporativismo e Neocorporativismo: O Exame de Duas Trajetórias," BIB no. 32, 1-39.
- Archetti, Eduardo P., Cammack, Paul, and Bryan Roberts, eds.
1987 Latin America. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Arretche, Marta T.S.
1995 "Emergência e Desenvolvimento do *Welfare State*: Teorias Explicativas," BIB 39, 3-40.
- Azais, Christian, e Paola Cappellin
1993 "Para uma Análise das Classes Sociais," BIB no. 35, 25-40.
- Bachrach, Peter
1967 A Theory of Democratic Elitism. Boston: Little, Brown.
- "Back to the Barracks"
1985 Third World Quarterly 7 (January), 9-143.
- Balbus, Isaac D.
1971 "The Concept of Interest in Pluralist and Marxian Analysis," Politics & Society 1 (February), 155-177.
- Balroya, Enrique, ed.
1987 Comparing New Democracies: Dilemmas of Transition and Consolidation in Mediterranean Europe and the Southern Cone. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Baran, Paul
1942 A Theory of the Capitalist State.
- Baran, Paul, e Paul Sweezy
1966 Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Barros, Robert
1986 "The Left and Democracy: Recent Debates in Latin America," Telos #68 (Summer), 49-70.
- Beltrno, Hélio
1984 Descentralização e Liberdade. Rio de Janeiro: Record.
- Black, Jan Knippers
1986 Sentinels of Empire: The United States and Latin American Militarism. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Borón, Atilio
1979 "New Forms of the Capitalist State in Latin America: An Exploration," Race and Class 20 (no 3), 263-276.
1994 "A Razão Extraviada: A Crítica Neoliberal e o Estado nos Capitalismos Contemporâneos," págs. 185-207 em Atilio Borón, Estado, Capitalismo e Democracia na América Latina, Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Bresser Pereira, Luiz Carlos
1972 Tecnoburocracia e Contestação. Petrópolis: Vozes.
1974 Empresários e Administradores no Brasil. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1978 O Colapso de uma Aliança de Classes: A Burguesia e a Crise do Autoritarismo Tecnoburocrático. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1981a Estado e Subdesenvolvimento Industrializado: Esboço de uma Economia Política Periférica, 2ª edição. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1981b A Sociedade Estatal e a Tecnoburocracia. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1984 Desenvolvimento e Crise no Brasil: 1930-1983. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1985 Pactos Políticos. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1986 Lucro, Acumulação e Crise. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
1990 "Crise e Renovação da Esquerda na América Latina," Lua Nova 21 (outubro), 41-54.

- 1992a A Crise do Estado: Ensaio sobre a Economia Brasileira. São Paulo: Nobel.
- 1992b "Liberalization and Democratization in the Context of a Weak State and a Weaker Civil Society," Texto para Discussão, Departamento de Economia, Fundação Getúlio Vargas, no. 17, (agosto), mimeo.
- 1993a "Economic Reforms and Cycles of State Intervention," World Development 21 (August), 1337-1353.
- 1993b "Uma Interpretação da América Latina: A Crise do Estado," Novos Estudos CEBRAP 37 (novembro),
- 1996 Crise Econômica e Reforma do Estado no Brasil: Para uma Nova Interpretação da América Latina. São Paulo: Editora 34. (Economic Crisis and State Reform in Brazil, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.)
- 1997a "Managerial Reform in Brazil's Public Administration," paper prepared for the Congress of the International Political Science Association (IPSA), Seoul, Korea, August, mimeo, 32 pp.
- 1997b "A Reforma do Estado dos anos 90: Lógica e Mecanismos de Controle," Cadernos MARE da Reforma do Estado Caderno 1, 1-58.
- 1997c "State Reform in the 1990s: Logic and Control Mechanisms," paper presented at the seminar "The Changing Role of the State", Annual Meetings of the World Bank Group and the International Monetary Fund, Hong Kong, September 23, mimeo, 38 pp.
- ; Przeworski, Adam, Juan M. Maravall
- 1993 "Reformas Econômicas em Democracias Recentes: Um Abordagem Social-Democrata," Dados 36 (no. 2),
- 1996 Reformas Econômicas em Democracias Novas: Uma Proposta Social-Democrata. São Paulo: Nobel. (Economic Reforms in New Democracies: A Social Democratic Approach, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- , e Peter Spink, orgs.
- 1998 Reforma do Estado e Administração Pública Gerencial. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- Buchanan, James
- 1975 The Limits of Liberty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cammack, Paul
- 1986 "Resurgent Democracy: Threat and Promise," New Left Review #157 (May/June), 121-128.
- Canak, William L.
- 1984 "The Peripheral State Debate: State Capitalist and Bureaucratic-Authoritarian Regimes in Latin America," Latin American Research Review 19 (no 1), 3-36.
- Cavarozzi, M., e Manuel A. Garretón
- 1989 Muerte y resurrección -- Los partidos políticos y las transiciones del Cono Sur. Santiago: FLACSO.
- Caviedes, Cesar
- 1984 The Southern Cone: Realities of the Authoritarian State in South America. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Chaffee, Wilbur A.
- 1984 "The Political Economy of Revolution and Democracy: Toward a Theory of Latin American Politics," American Journal of Economics and Sociology 43 (October), 385-398.
- Chalmers, Douglas A., and Craig H. Robinson
- 1982 "Why Power Contenders Choose Liberalization: Perspectives from South America," International Studies Quarterly 26 (March), 3-36.
- Chilcote, Edward B., e Ronald H. Chilcote
- 1991 "A Crise do Marxismo: Uma Apreciação de Novos Rumos," Revista de Ciências Sociais 22 (1/2), 1-37. ("The Crisis of Marxism: An Appraisal of New Directions," trabalho preparado para "Marxism Now: Traditions and Difference," University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 30 de novembro-2 de dezembro de 1989, mimeo, 32 pp.)
- Chilcote, Ronald H.
- 1988 "Capitalist and Socialist Perspectives in the Search for a Class Theory of the State and Democracy," trabalho preparado para "Comparative Politics: Research Perspectives for the Next Twenty Years", City

- University of New York Graduate School, 7 a 9 de setembro, 38 pp., mimeo. (Versão revisada, dezembro de 1988)
- 1990a "Post-Marxism: The Retreat from Class in Latin America," Latin American Perspectives 17 (Spring), 3-24.
- 1990b "Tensions in the Latin American Experience: Fundamental Themes in the Formulation of a Research Agenda for the 1990s," Latin American Perspectives 17 (Spring), 122-128.
- 1991 "Capitalist and Socialist Perspectives in the Search for a Class Theory of the State and Democracy," pp. 75-97 em Dankwart Rustow e Kenneth Erickson (eds.), Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives, New York: Harper and Collins. (Versão final de Chilcote 1988)
- 1995 "Teoria de Classes," BIB no. 39, 85-101.
- Ciria, Alberto
- 1978 "Old Wine in New Bottles?: Corporatism in Latin America," Latin American Research Review 13 (no 3), 211-213.
- Cockcroft, James D.
- 1989 Neighbors in Turmoil: Latin America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Collier, David, ed.
- 1982 O Novo Autoritarismo na América Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. (The New Authoritarianism in Latin America, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979)
- Cumings, Bruce
- 1989 "The Abortive Abertura: South Korea in the Light of Latin American Experience," New Left Review #173 (January/February), 5-32.
- Cunill Grau, Nuria
- 1997 Repensando lo público a través de la sociedad: Nuevas formas de gestión pública y representación social. Caracas: CLAD/Editorial Nueva Sociedad.
- Cunningham, Frank
- 1975-76 "Pluralism and Class Struggle," Science & Society 39 (Winter), 385-416.
- Dahl, Robert A.
- 1958 "A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model," American Political Science Review 52 (June), 463-469.
- 1961 Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 1971 Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 1982 Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy versus Control. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 1989 Um Prefácio B Teoria Democrática. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (A Preface to Democratic Theory, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956)
- 1990 Um Prefácio B Democracia Econômica. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (A Preface to Economic Democracy, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985)
- 1993 "Porque Mercados Livres Não Bastam," Lua Nova 28/29, 227-235. ("Why Free Markets Are Not Enough," Journal of Democracy 3 (1992), 82-89)
- "Democratization and Class Struggle"
- 1988 Latin American Perspectives 15 (Summer), 3-150.
- "Dialectics of Democracy in Latin America"
- 1986 Contemporary Marxism #14, 1-127.
- Diamond, Larry; Linz, Juan J., and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds.
- 1989 Democracy in Developing Countries -- Volume 4, Latin America. Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers & Adamantine Press. Ltd.
- Diniz, Eli
- 1996 Crise, Reforma do Estado e Governabilidade. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Getúlio Vargas.
- , e Sérgio Azevedo, orgs.
- 1997 Reforma do Estado e Democracia no Brasil: Dilemas e Perspectivas. Brasília: Editora UnB.
- Domhoff, G. William
- 1970 The Higher Circles: The Governing Class in America. New York: Random House.
- 1978 The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America. New York: Random

- House.
- dos Santos, Luiz Alberto
1997 Reforma Administrativa no Contexto da Democracia: A PEC no. 173/95, suas implicações e adequação ao Estado brasileiro. Brasília, DF: DIAP/Arko Advice Editorial.
- Drake, Paul W., e Eduardo Silva, eds.
1986 Elections and Democratization in Latin America, 1980-85. San Diego: Center for Iberian and Latin American Studies, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, Institute of the Americas, University of California, San Diego.
- Easton, David
1968 Uma Teoria de Análise Política. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (A Framework for Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965)
1970a "Categorias para a Análise de Sistemas em Política," págs. 185-199 em David Easton (org.), Modalidades da Análise Política, Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (Varieties of Political Analysis, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966)
1970b "Uma Tentativa Análise dos Sistemas Políticos," págs. 22-42 em Maria Stella de Amorim, (org.), Sociologia Política II, Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
1982 "O Sistema Político Sitiado pelo Estado," págs. 129-149 em Bolivar Lamounier (org.), A Ciência Política nos Anos 80, Brasília, DF: Editora UnB. ("The Political System Besieged by the State," Political Theory 9 (August 1981), 303-325)
- Edel, Matthew
1987 "On Local Elections and Government in Latin America and the Caribbean," Monthly Review 39 (September), 50-52.
- Eidlin, Fred, ed.
1983 Constitutional Democracy: Essays in Comparative Politics. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Ethier, Diane, org.
1990 Democratic Transition and Consolidation in Southern Europe, Latin America and Southeast Asia. London: Macmillan.
- Fagen, Richard R.; Deere, Carmen Diana; and Jose Luis Coraggio, eds.
1986 Transition and Development: Problems of Third World Socialism. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Felix, David
1986 "On Financial Blowups and Authoritarian Regimes," págs. 85-125 in Jonathan Hartley and Samuel A. Morley (eds.), Latin American Political Economy: Financial Crisis and Political Change, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Freitag, Barbara
1986 A Teoria Crítica: Ontem e Hoje. São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Freitag, Barbara, e Sérgio Paulo Rouanet
1980 Habermas. São Paulo: ;tica. (Coleção Grandes Cientistas Sociais, No. 15)
- Friedman, Milton
1962 Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
-----, e Rose Friedman
1979 Free to Choose. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Garretón, Manuel
1986 "The Failure of Dictatorships in the Southern Cone," Telos #68 (Summer), 71-78.
1995 Hacia una nueva era política -- estudio sobre las democratizaciones. Santiago: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Gillespie, Charles G.
1987 "From Authoritarian Crises to Democratic Transitions," (review article) Latin American Research Review 22 (no 3), 165-184.
- Goodman, Louis W.; Mendelson, Johanna S.R.; and Juan Rial, eds.
1990 The Military and Democracy: The Future of Civil-Military Relations in Latin America. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Groth, Terrie R.

1991 "Diagnosing and Treating the Radical Malaise," trabalho apresentado no XVI^o Congresso Internacional da Latin American Studies Association, Washington, DC, 4 a 6 de abril, mimeo, 25 pp.

1997a "Bases Conceituais da Reforma do Estado", trabalho apresentado na Sessão 55 "State Reform", do IV^o Congresso da Brazilian Studies Association, 12 a 15 de novembro, Washington, DC, mimeo, 25 pp.

1997b "Reformulando a Declaração Política Contemporânea: Uma Proposta Baseada em Experiências Latino-americanas", trabalho preparado para o XX^o Congresso Internacional da Latin American Studies Association, Guadalajara, México, 17 a 19 de abril, mimeo, 31 pp.

-----, e José Deocleciano de Siqueira Silva Júnior

1997 "Democracia e Reforma do Estado: Contradição ou Conjuração?", trabalho preparado para apresentação na Sessão de Comunicações Coordenadas "Democracia e Reforma do Estado" do III^o Seminário Nacional sobre Comportamento Político, 11 a 13 de junho, Florianópolis, SC, mimeo, 31 pp.

-----, e Marisa von Bülow

1997 "Movimentos Sociais e Reforma do Estado: Confrontação ou Participação?", trabalho preparado para apresentação no XXI^o Congresso da Associação Latinoamericana de Sociologia no GT 04 "Reformas do Estado, Políticas Públicas e Gasto Social" Sessão 02 "Privatização, Reforma do Estado e Ação Coletiva", 31 de agosto a 05 de setembro, Universidade de São Paulo, SP, mimeo, 31 pp.

Grynszpan, Mário

1996 "A Teoria das Elites e sua Genealogia Consagrada," BIB no. 41, 35-84.

Gutiérrez, Fernando Calderón, and Mario R. dos Santos, comps.

1987 Latinoamérica: Lo político y lo social en la crisis. Buenos Aires: CLACSO (Biblioteca de Ciencias Sociales).

Habermas, Jürgen

1980 A Crise da Legitimação no Capitalismo Tardio. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

1982 Conhecimento e Interesse. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

Haggard, Stephan

1996 "A Reforma do Estado na América Latina," em C.G. Langoni, A Nova América Latina, São Paulo: Fundação Getúlio Vargas.

-----, e Robert Kaufman

1995 The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Handelman, Howard, and Thomas G. Sanders, eds.

1981 Military Government and the Movement Toward Democracy in South America. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, Timothy, and James Petras

1988 "Introduction: Democratization and Class Struggle," Latin American Perspectives 15 (Summer), 3-17.

Harris, Richard L.

1988 "Marxism and the Transition to Socialism in Latin America," Latin American Perspectives 15 (Winter), 7-53.

Hartlyn, Jonathan, and Samuel A. Morley

1986 "Bureaucratic-Authoritarian Regimes in Comparative Perspective," págs. 38-53 in Latin American Political Economy: Financial Crisis and Political Change, Boulder: Westview Press.

Hayek, F.A.

1982 "Liberdade para o Progresso," pp. 55-71 em Anthony de Crespigny e Kenneth R. Minogue (orgs.), Filosofia Política Contemporânea, 2^a edição, Brasília, DF: Editora UnB. (#8)

1987 O Caminho da Servidão. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Liberal. (The Road to Serfdom, 1944)

Herman, Edward S., and James Petras

1985 "Resurgent Democracy: Rhetoric and Reality," New Left Review #154 (November/December), 83-98.

Herz, John H.

- 1978 "On Reestablishing Democracy after the Downfall of Authoritarian or Dictatorial Regimes," Comparative Politics 10 (July), 559-562.
- 1982 (ed.) Dictatorship to Democracy. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Holanda, Nilson
- 1993 "A Crise Gerencial do Estado Brasileiro," em Jono Paulo Reis Velloso (org.), Brasil: A Superação da Crise, São Paulo: Nobel.
- Jay, Martin
- 1989 La Imaginación Dialéctica, una Historia de la Escuela de Frankfurt. Madrid: Taurus. (The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research. Boston: Little, Brown, 1973)
- Ketl, Donald F.
- 1994 Reinventing Government? Appraising the National Performance Review. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, Center for Public Management.
- , e J. Dilulio
- 1994 Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, Center for Public Management.
- Lindblom, Charles
- 1977 Politics and Markets: The World's Political-Economic Systems. New York: Basic Books.
- 1981 O Processo de Decisão Política. Brasília, DF: Editora UnB.
- Linz, Juan
- 1978 The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Crisis, Breakdown, & Reequilibration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 1980 "Regimes Autoritários," págs. 121-215 em Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro (coord.), O Estado Autoritário e os Movimentos Populares, Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. (Comentários e debate, pp. 219-238) (Possivelmente uma versão de "Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes," pags. 175-411 in Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), Handbook of Political Science, Vol 3: Macropolitical Theory, Reading, PA: Addison-Wesley, 1975)
- , e Alfred Stepan, eds.
- 1978 The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes: Latin America, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 1993 Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin
- 1966 A Sociedade Americana: Uma Análise Histórica e Comparada. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (The First New Nation -- The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective, New York: Basic Books, 1963)
- 1967 O Homem Político (Political Man). Rio: Zahar. (Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics. New York: Doubleday, 1960)
- Lopez, George A., e Michael Stohl, eds.
- 1987 Liberalization and Redemocratization in Latin America. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Lowi, Theodore J.
- 1992 "The State in Political Science: How We Become What We Study," American Political Science Review 86 (March), 1-7.
- MacEwan, Arthur
- 1988 "Transitions from Authoritarian Rule," Latin American Perspectives 15 (Summer), 115-130. (Resenha de O'Donnell, Schmitter, e Whitehead)
- Mainwaring, Scott; Guillermo O'Donnell e J. Samuel Valenzuela, eds.
- 1992 Issues in Democratic Consolidation. University of Notre Dame Press.
- , e Timothy Scully, eds.
- 1995 Building Democratic Institutions. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Malloy, James M., ed.
- 1977 (ed.) Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Latin America. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh

- Press.
 1993 "Política Econ[^]mica e o Problema da Governabilidade nos Andes Centrais", págs. em Lourdes Sola (org.), Estado, Mercado e Democracia: Política Econ[^]mica Comparada. Sao Paulo, Paz & Terra.
- , e Mitchell A. Seligson, eds.
 1987 Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- , e Robert Kaufman
 1993 "O Estado no Processo de Iniciação e Consolidação Democrática", págs. em Lourdes Sola (org.), Estado, Mercado e Democracia: Política Econ[^]mica Comparada. Sao Paulo, Paz & Terra.
- MARE/BID/ONU (Ministério da Administração Federal e Reforma do Estado/Banco Interamericano de Desenvolvimento/Organização das Nações Unidas)
 1996 Papers Apresentados ao Seminário A Reforma do Estado na América Latina e no Caribe: Rumo a uma Adminsitração Pdblica Gerencial. Brasília, DF: MARE, Secretaria da Reforma do Estado.
- Marques, Eduardo Cesar
 1997 "Notas Críticas B Literatura sobre Estado, Políticas Estatais e Atores Políticos," BIB no 43, 67-102.
- Mello e Souza, Nelson
 1985 Dialética do Irracionalismo: Pareto e seu Confronto com Marx. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira.
- Miliband, Ralph
 1972 O Estado na Sociedade Capitalista. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar. (The State in Capitalist Society: An Analysis of the Western System of Power, New York: Basic Books, 1969)
 1979a "O Estado na Sociedade Capitalista," págs. 62-70 em Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Carlos Estevam Martins (orgs.), Política e Sociedade, Volume I, Sno Paulo: Nacional.
 1979b "O Sistema Estatal e a Elite do Estado," págs. 135-147 em Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Carlos Estevam Martins (orgs.), Política e Sociedade, Volume I, Sno Paulo: Nacional.
 1983a Class Power and State Power. London: Verso.
 1983b "State Power and Class Interests," New Left Review #138 (), 57-68.
- Mitchell, Timothy
 1991 "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics," American Political Science Review 85 (March), 77-96.
- Munck, Ronaldo
 1990 "Farewell to Socialism? A Comment on Recent Debates," Latin American Perspectives 17 (Spring), 113-121.
- Needler, Martin C.
 1987 The Problem of Democracy in Latin America. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Nef, Jorge
 1983a "Political Democracy in Latin America: An Exploration into the Nature of Two Political Projects," pp. 161-181 in Archibald Ritter and David Pollock (eds.), Latin American Prospects for the 1980s: Equity, Democratization, and Development, New York: Praeger.
 1983b "Stalemate and Repression in the Southern Cone: An Interpretive Synopsis," New Scholar 8, 371-385.
 1986 "Redemocratization in Latin America, or the Modernization of the Status Quo?" Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies 11 (no 21), 43-55.
 1988 "The Trend Toward Democratization and Redemocratization in Latin America: Shadow and Substance," (review article) Latin American Research Review 23 no 3, 131-153.
- O'Brien, Philip, and Paul Cammack, eds.
 1985 Generals in Retreat: The Crisis of Military Rule in Latin America. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- O'Connor, James
 1977 USA: A Crise do Estado Capitalista. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
 (The Fiscal Crisis of the State, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974)
 1984 Accumulation Crisis. New York: Blackwell.

O'Donnell, Guillermo

1973 Modernization and Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism: Studies in South American Politics. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

1980 "Desenvolvimento Político ou Mudança Política?" pp. 25-95 em Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro (coord.), O Estado Autoritário e os Movimentos Populares, Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. (Comentários de debate, págs. 99-118)

1981a "Anotações para uma Teoria do Estado (I)," Revista de Cultura e Política 3 (novembro/janeiro), 71-93.

1981b "Anotações para uma Teoria do Estado (II)," Revista de Cultura e Política 4 (fevereiro/abril), 71-82.

1981c "As forças armadas e o estado autoritário no cone sul da América Latina," Dados 24 (no 3), 277-304.

1982 "Reply to Remmer and Merx," Latin American Research Review 17 (no 2), 41-50.

1987a BA -- Reflexes sobre os Estados Burocrático-Autoritários. São Paulo: Vértice. (Publicado originalmente como "Reflexiones sobre las tendencias generales de cambio en el estado burocrático autoritario," Estudios CEDES, no. 1, 1976; também como "Reflections on the Patterns of Change in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State," Latin American Research Review 13 (no. 1), 1978: 3-38)

1987b Contrapontos: Autoritarismo e Democratização. São Paulo: Vértice. (Capítulo 1 "Tenstes ..." publicado como "Tensions in the Bureaucratic-Authoritarian State and the Question of Democracy," págs. 285-318 em Collier 1979)

1988a "Hiatos, Instituições e Perspectivas Democráticas," págs. 72-90 em Fábio Wanderley Reis e Guillermo O'Donnell (eds.), A Democracia no Brasil: Dilemas e Perspectivas, São Paulo, Vértices.

1988b "Transições, Continuidades e Alguns Paradoxos," págs. 41-71 em Fábio Wanderley Reis e Guillermo O'Donnell (eds.), A Democracia no Brasil: Dilemas e Perspectivas, São Paulo, Vértices.

1990 Análise do Autoritarismo Burocrático. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. (Bureaucratic Authoritarianism: Argentina, 1966-1973, in Comparative Perspective, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988)

1991 "Democracia Delegativa?" Novos Estudos CEBRAP 31 (outubro)

1993 "On the State, Democratization and Some Conceptual Problems: A Latin American View with Glances at Some Post-Communist Countries", World Development 21, no. 8,

1996 "Uma Outra Institucionalização: América Latina e Alhures", Lua Nova no. 37,

-----, Schmitter, Philippe C., e Laurence Whitehead, eds.

1986 Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Prospects for Democracy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Offe, Claus

1975 "The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation págs. 125-144 em Leon Lindberg, Robert Alford, Colin Crouch, e Claus Offe (eds.), Stress and Contradictions in Modern Capitalism, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

1979 "Capitalismo Avançado e o Welfare State," págs. 211-219 em Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Carlos Estevam Martins (orgs.), Política & Sociedade, Volume 2, São Paulo: Nacional. ("Advanced Capitalism and the Welfare State," Politics & Society 2 (Summer 1972), 479-488)

1984a "Dominação de Classe e Sistema Político: Sobre a Seletividade das Instituições Políticas," págs. 140-177 em Claus Offe, Problemas Estruturais do Estado Capitalista, Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

1984b Problemas Estruturais do Estado Capitalista. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro. (Contradictions of the Welfare State. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1984)

1984c "Tese sobre a Fundamentação do Conceito 'Estado Capitalista'," págs. 122-137 em Claus Offe, Problemas Estruturais do Estado Capitalista, Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

1989 Capitalismo Desorganizado: Transformações Contemporâneas do Trabalho e da Política. São Paulo: Brasiliense. (Disorganized Capitalism, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985)

Orme, J.

1988 "Dismounting the Tiger: Lessons from Four Liberalizations," Political Science Quarterly 103 (Summer), 245-265.

- Orrego Vicuña, F., ed.
1985 Transición a la democracia en América Latina. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano.
- Osborne, David, e Ted Gaebler
1994 Reinventando o Governo: Como o Espírito Empreendedor Está Transformando o Setor Público. Brasília, DF: MH Comunicação. (Reinventing Government - How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992.)
- Pastor, Robert A., ed.
1989 Democracy in the Americas: Stopping the Pendulum. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Petras, James
1979 "Political Change, Class Conflict, and the Decline of Latin American Fascism," Monthly Review 31 (June), 26-37.
1986 "The Redemocratization Process," Contemporary Marxism #14 (Fall), 1-15.
1987 "The Anatomy of State Terror: Chile, El Salvador, and Brazil," Science & Society 51 (Fall), 314-338.
1988 "The State, Regime, and the Democratization Muddle," LASA Forum 18 (Winter), 9-12.
- ; Brill, Howard; Engbarth, Dennis; Herman, Edward S. and Morris H. Morley
1986 Latin America: Bankers, Generals, and the Struggle for Social Justice. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Philip, George
1985 The Military in South American Politics. London: Croom Helm.
- Poulantzas, Nicos
1977a Poder Político e Classes Sociais. São Paulo: Martins Fontes. (Political Power and Social Classes, London: New Left Books/Sheed & Ward, 1973)
1977b "As Transformações Atuais do Estado, a Crise Política e a Crise do Estado," págs. 3-41 em Nicos Poulantzas, et.al., O Estado em Crise, Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
1978 As Classes Sociais no Capitalismo Hoje, 2ª edição. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
1979a "A Noção de Estado em Marx," págs. 53-61 em Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Carlos Estevam Martins (orgs.), Política e Sociedade, Volume I, São Paulo: Nacional.
1979b "The Political Crisis and the Crisis of the State," págs. 357-393 em J.W. Freiberg (ed.), Critical Sociology: European Perspectives, New York: Irvington.
1981 O Estado, o Poder e o Socialismo. Rio de Janeiro: Graal. (State, Power, Socialism, London: New Left Books, 1978)
1982 "O Problema do Estado Capitalista," págs. 219-233 em Robin Blackburn (org.), Ideologia na Ciência Social: Ensaio Crítico sobre a Teoria Social, Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra. ("The Problem of the Capitalist State," págs. 238-253 em Robin Blackburn (ed.), Ideology in the Social Sciences, New York: Random House, 1972)
- Przeworski, Adam
1994 Democracia e Mercado: Reformas Políticas e Econômicas no Leste Europeu e na América Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará. (Democracy and the Market -- Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
1995 Sustainable Democracy. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Remmer, Karen L.
1985 "Redemocratization and the Impact of Authoritarian Rule in Latin America," Comparative Politics 17 (April), 253-275.
1989 Military Rule in Latin America. Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- , and Gilbert W. Merkx
1982 "Bureaucratic-Authoritarianism Revisited," Latin American Research Review 17 (no 2), 3-40.
- Richards, Gordon
1985 "The Rise and Decline of Military Authoritarianism in Latin America: The Role of Stabilization Policy," SAIS Review 5 (Summer/Fall), 155-171.
1986 "Stabilization Crises and the Breakdown of Military Authoritarianism in Latin America,"

- Comparative Political Studies 18 (January), 449-485.
- Roberts, Kenneth
1985 "Democracy and the Dependent Capitalist State in Latin America," Monthly Review 37 (October), 12-26.
- Roett, Riordan
1985 "The Foreign Debt Crisis and the Process of Redemocratization in Latin America," págs. 207-230 em William N. Eskridge, jr. (ed.), A Dance Along the Precipice: The Political and Economic Dimensions of the International Debt Problem, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Rouquié, Alain
1987 The Military and the State in Latin America. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rueschemeyer Dietrich, et.al.
1992 Capitalist Development and Democracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sader, Emir, e Pablo Gentili, orgs.
1995 Pós-Neoliberalismo: As Políticas Sociais e o Estado Democrático. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Schroyer, Trent
1973 The Critique of Domination: The Origins and Development of Critical Theory. New York: Braziller.
- Schumpeter, Joseph
1984 Capitalismo, Socialismo e Democracia. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
(Capitalism, Socialism, Democracy. London: Allen & Unwin, 1943)
- Share, Donald
1987 "Transitions to Democracy and Transition Through Transaction," Comparative Political Studies 19 (January), 525-548.
- Silva, Sérgio
1994 "As Propostas Neoliberais, o Mercado e a Sociedade," Idéias vol. 1 (no. 1, janeiro/junho): 139-153.
- Silva-Michelena, JosJ, ed.
1988 Latin America: Peace, Democratization and Economic Crisis. London: Zed Press Ltd.
- Slater, Phil
1977 Origin and Significance of the Frankfurt School: A Marxist Perspective. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Sola, Lourdes, org.
1993 Estado, Mercado e Democracia: Política e Economia Comparadas. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Stepan, Alfred A.
1971 The Military in Politics: Changing Patterns in Brazil. New Haven: Yale University Press.
1973 "The New Professionalismo of Internal Warfare and Military Role Expansion," págs. 47-65 em Alfred A. Stepan (ed.), Authoritarian Brazil: Origins, Policies, and Future, New Haven: Yale University Press.
1985 "State Power and the Strength of Civil Society in the Southern Cone of Latin America," págs. 317-343 in Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, e Theda Skocpol (eds.), Bringing the State Back In, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1988 Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- "Succession in the South"
1988 Third World Quarterly 10 (January), 1-288.
- Therborn, G`ran
1979 "The Travail of Latin American Democracy," New Left Review #113-114 (January-April), 71-109.
- Toledo, Enrique de la Garza
1995 "Neoliberalismo e Estado," págs. 71-89 em Asa Cristina Laurell (org.), Estado e Políticas Sociais no Neoliberalismo, São Paulo: Cortez Editora.
- Varas, Augusto, ed.
1989 Democracy Under Siege: New Military Power in Latin America. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Vasconi, Tomás A.

- 1990 "Democracy and Socialism in South America," Latin American Perspectives 17 (Spring), 25-38.
- Welch, Claude, jr.
1987 No Farewell to Arms? Military Disengagement from Politics in Africa and Latin America.
Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wesson, Robert
1982 Democracy in Latin America: Promise and Problems. New York: Praeger Publishers.
1986 (ed.) The Latin American Military Institution. New York: Praeger.
1988 (ed.) Democracy World Survey 1987. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Wiarda, Howard J., ed.
1980 The Continuing Struggle for Democracy in Latin America. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Woddis, Jack
1977 Armies and Politics. New York: International Publishers.
- Young, Oran R.
1970 Introdução B Análise de Sistemas Políticos. io de Janeiro: Zahar.