

includes an examination of the forms of surplus extraction. It also includes an examination of how the production process is influenced by the market and the way peasants are integrated in it at the local and international level. Central to this integration is the commoditization of production and the extent of the participation of peasants in it whether as producers or consumers. Moreover, the

structural/historical approaches are necessarily historical, for “commoditization” does not imply a process which must work itself out in a particular way and which can be known from purely theoretical reasoning. It is a process which may take many specific forms in different contexts.¹²⁹

In addition:

The approach also seeks to grasp the relationships between “whole” and “part” in such a way as to understand their mutual determination, and it particularly considers the relationships between agrarian society and the rest of the state of which it is a part. The “individual” does not disappear in these analyses, but the social character of the individual is emphasized.¹³⁰

One variant within this approach is what is called the articulation of modes of production. This has been criticized on several grounds, but perhaps the most important has been its conception of the relationship between capitalism and the noncapitalist or precapitalist modes in functionalist terms. This error, as Bernstein writes, of

a functionalist conception of the relations between capital and peasants in which the latter are “reproduced” by the former (in the pursuit of its interests etc.). It is not capital [or] imperialism which reproduces the peasantry—the peasantry reproduces themselves

¹²⁹Ibid., 23.

¹³⁰Ibid.