

sphere of capitalist production, but putting restraints on it at the same time. The peasants' identity is defined not only in relationship to capitalist production relations in general, but to the capitalist state in particular; thus, "peasants have to be located in their relations with capital and the state, in other words within capitalist relations of production mediated through forms of household production which are the site of a struggle for effective possession and control between producers and capital/state" (Bernstein, 1982:176). Furthermore, the notion of peasants as 'wage-labour equivalents' is now modified, though not rejected, in that "in a relative sense (it) limits the subjugation and real subsumption of household labour by capital to the extent that the producers are not fully expropriated nor dependent for their reproduction on the sale of labour-power through the wage-form" (ibid., 1982).

The other trend in defining peasant economies in relationship to capital comes from Shanin (1984). In a recent work he, in common with Bernstein, rejects the 'articulation model' and cruder concepts of subsumption of the peasantry (i.e. peasants as 'disguised proletarians'). Shanin's approach stresses the 'economic specificity of peasant production' beginning with the 'units and processes of production' exemplified in the operation of the family farm, and the constellation of factors related to it: division of labour, self-exploitation, 'life/farming rhythms', occupational linkages of household members, etc. (Shanin, 1984:4c4-4c5). The study of the internal dynamics of peasant production is thus seen as the essential beginning for defining its relationship to the broader political economy in which it is located. Shanin, therefore, makes no generalization about the linkages of peasant economy to capitalism, leaving its determination to the historically specific formation within which it is examined.

In my utilization of theoretical models of peasant economies in