

that the living and working conditions of this class were continuously changing along with changes in the wider economy (Lenin,1960:177-8).

Referring to the economic functions of migrant labour, Lenin rejects the idea that this class, in the long run, remains necessary for capitalism. The "big capitalist", according to Lenin, cannot afford to employ the migrant labourer and pay him low wages, since the latter can leave at any time in order to migrate to a higher paying job (Lenin,1960). Elaborating on this point Lenin adds:

As with under developed capitalism anywhere, so here, we see that the worker is particularly oppressed by small capital. The big employer is forced by sheer commercial considerations to abstain from petty oppression, which is of little advantage and is fraught with considerable loss should disputes arise. That is why the big employers, for example... try to keep their workers from leaving at the end of the week, and themselves fix prices according to the demand for labor;... A small employer, on the contrary, sticks at nothing. The farmsteaders and German colonists carefully 'choose' their workers and pay them 15, or 20 per cent more; but the amount of work they squeeze out of them is 50 per cent more. (Lenin, 1960; pp. 245-246)

Moreover, the functionalist logic adopted by this school of neo-marxists calls into question the status of the process of transition and casts serious doubts around the nature of the relationship between the modes of production involved. Of particular importance in this regard is the statement that, "...the mode of operation of capitalist enterprises...[is] conditioned by the process of the formation of the average rate of profit and the effects of this upon the forms of capitalist calculation." (Wolpe,1980:40) This assertion is shared by most articulationists. Thus, Burawoy's criticism of Wolpe's explanation of the process of transition was not directed against the functionalist approach per se; instead, Burawoy suggested that