structure of the village (p. 19). Thus, the unit of analysis here is the <u>village</u>, and not the <u>farming unit</u> or the <u>peasant household</u>, the latter being inappropriate for the determination not only of internal (class) differentiation but also the delineation of 'social and economic complementarities on regional lines'. I will outline below the summary of this classification of village types:

1. Villages dominated by petty commodity production. This type includes villages that project 'proletarianization of the insufficiently commercial producers'; those typified by seasonal migration (semi-proletarianization); and those - because they are unable to diversify their economic activities - are on the verge of economic extinction. Those conceptual categories prevail in 90% of Turkish villages and apply to two kinds of villages, both characterized by peasant smallholdings (30-100 dunums) and high out-migration. But whereas migration in the second type of village led to internal diversification of the village economy (introduction of cash crops and commoditization), it transformed the first kind into a residential unit wholly dependent on migration stipends, with subsistence crops continuing in only some of the peasant households (pp. 5-11). The key variables here are seasonal migration and the reduced size of peasant holdings. In the first case, the traditional structure became obsolete under the permanent impact of out-migration, while in the second case remunerations from migrant sources injected the village economy with 'a new and viable economic momentum essentially based on its traditional The advantages of seasonal migration for the national economy lie in its role of reproducing the labour force under conditions undertaken in the village itself, i.e. within the farming household, and not through wages received (p. 20). At the same time, the existence of wages from sources external to the village allows for lowering the prices