

peasant.

- 2 -

All the above assumptions of transitional forms in agrarian development have certain implicit assumptions about the relationship between capital and the peasantry that are not always spelt out. In the several paradigms about agrarian change discussed in the introduction, we come across three different conceptions of this relationship.

In the 'dissolution-conservation' model, outlined here by Wolpe, the assumption involves a strained relationship between a pre-capitalist mode (the tribal Reserves) subjugated to, and serving the internal needs of, the capitalist mode. This is a modified model of the two articulated modes discussed above.

In the discussion of transitional forms of Turkish agriculture, a Wallerstenian model is adopted in which the capitalist market, both local and international, and the state are apparently acting as the main agents of rural transformation, and performing the role of catalysts for intra-village differentiation ('aggregate shifts') and class polarization within the peasantry. This model, however, does not see capitalist agriculture as penetrating the rural domain in such a way as to create a capital/wage-labour relationship within agriculture. Rather, the agrarian sector is incorporated and subsumed in the capitalist sector. Peasants are controlled by capital through unequal terms of trade; through credit arrangements with urban financiers and rural usurious capital; and through the fiscal policies of the state.

In the various models generated by the Differentiation Debate discussed here, we encounter two broad notions of peasant economies in relationship to capital. One is an elaboration of the 'subsumption' idea, which sees the peasants as retaining a certain autonomy within the