

of the Arab village is the reason for the indigenous economy's failure to develop capitalistically. Due to overpopulation, the land inheritance system and the lack of investment in the village, Arab villages, it is maintained, were inherently underdeveloped and the villagers always underemployed. This state, it is further argued, places the employer at an advantage. Since there was always abundant labor at his disposal he could exploit the peasant proletariat as he pleased without fear of running out of potential replacements. Hence, Carmi and Rosenfeld contend that the employer could get away with paying "a replacement or alternative cost only", rather than the worker's cost of production (Carmi and Rosenfeld, 1980:190-92).

While this neo-Marxist position provides a more adequate description of the relationship between capital and labour than the other, non-marxist approaches described above, it nonetheless also contains some major problems. It makes use of the articulation of modes of production thesis which has been extensively employed in the study of the South African and Rhodesian economies (Arrighi, 1973; Burawoy, 1976; Wolpe, 1980) and shares some conceptual problems associated with these studies.

At the theoretical level, this approach has been criticised as functionalist and a-historic, for it fails to explain the origin of various key phenomena, such as the origin of the class of migrant labour and the relationship between this class and colonial capitalism. In this framework the class of semi-peasant semi-proletariat is assumed to be static in nature and that it exists because it is functional to capitalism. Associated with this is also the assumption that the pre-capitalist economy is static and incapable of generating changes from within. This is emphatically demonstrated