

capitalism not be treated as a general concept, but rather, as a specific interest group (i.e., state, institution or industrial capital) (Burawoy, 1976).

Relations of production, class contradictions and exploitation, I would argue, cannot be adequately explained in terms of "capitalist calculations." The simplistic economism employed here tends to strip the relationship between the two modes of production of its contradictory and antagonistic nature, presenting them in a harmonic co-existence. The articulationist's overemphasis on the commodity exchange between "cheap labour power" and "low wages," and on the appropriation of surplus value (from pre-capitalist forms,) undermines the role of the social relations of production and obscures class contradictions. For one thing, as some authors have observed, what capitalism or imperialism "needs" from the colonies, is not limited to "cheap labour power" (Bradby,1980:112). By reviewing Lenin's and Luxemburg's theories of Imperialism, Bradby concludes that capitalism's "exterior needs" are neither permanent nor fixed, rather they are changeable under different stages of its development (Bradby,1980:113).

The fact that cheap labour power provides capital with higher rates of surplus value (Wolpe, 1980) or super profits (Burawoy, 1976), is not specific to South African or Rhodesian capitalist history. This phenomenon is characteristic of all peasant societies undergoing capitalist transition, particularly in the Third World (Lenin, 1960; Saleh, 1979; Patnaik, 1983; Barakat,1977).

What is objectionable here, however, is the fact that this class of cheap labourers is treated solely as an economic agent and not as a