

capitalist and pre-capitalist features (Rey,1982:157; Wolpe,1980). However, it is not the simultaneous presence of two or more modes of production, but rather the actual relationship between them, which distinguishes this neo-marxist approach from the accepted Marxist approach to capitalist transition. Capitalism, Marxists agree, is a process of transition which does not emerge at once, nor does it replace the old pre-capitalist systems immediately (Lenin, 1960:232; Saleh, 1979).

What is, however, specific to the notion of articulation is the kind of relationship it attributes to the combination of the two modes of production. It is this relationship of opposition and co-existence, referred to as "destruction/maintenance" (Rey,1982) or "domination-preservation" (Wolpe,1980), which, it will be argued, is what differentiates this neo-marxist approach from the Marxist approach of historical and dialectical materialism. Capitalism, articulationists maintain, "...can never eliminate the preceding modes of production, nor can it change the relations of pre-capitalist exploitation, during an entire period, capitalism must reinforce precapitalist relations of exploitation..." (Rey, 1982:XI).

In Third World countries, the "transitional mode" does not operate as a stage or as a phase in the process of capitalism, but, instead, the tendency is for it to acquire a permanent self-perpetuating character. Under colonialism, Rey maintains, "...capitalism dominates pre-capitalist modes of production..." but fails to "...absolutely penetrate the production of foodstuffs..." (Rey, 1982:52)

Capitalism, in other words, is only partially established in Third World countries. In the articulationist perspective, transition is the "ultimate result" and not just a phase in the process. Throughout the