

'superficial "surface" sale of products' the sale of their labour power....the 'subsistence production' of simple commodity producers (acts) 'as the specific form of reproduction of labour-power within a capitalist process of production'.

Under such conditions,

capitalist relations of production are mediated through household forms of production: the survival of the peasant small commodity production represents a specific form of capitalist class relations. In peripheral social formations, capitalist development in agriculture can lead to rural proletarianization which takes the form of the survival and reproduction of impoverished, small-scale peasant family-labour units. (97-98; emphasis in original).

Against this argument of peasants as 'concealed proletarians', Bernstein and others have regarded the mediation of capitalist relations of production through the peasant household as requiring a less reductionist analysis, and have suggested the notion of 'wage-labour equivalents' (Bernstein, 1977:73) as a term reflecting both the domination of capitalist relations, but also the persistence of a logic of peasant economy within it.

An alternative conception of peasant differentiation to this 'modified Leninism' has been the theoretical heritage of the Dynamic Studies approach associated with rural Russian studies at the turn of the century. Their emphasis on the farmstead as a unit of analysis, and on the demographic features of the peasant household in interpreting the mechanisms of peasant mobility and differentiation, has produced an original methodological breakthrough in the study of peasant economies. The main criticism levelled at the Chayanovian school has been its isolation of the notion of a 'peasant economy' from the wider constellation of social structure - capitalist or otherwise - in which it is embedded; and its attempt at generalizing conclusions drawn from Russian agrarian conditions, such as those created by the relatively free access