

In (1986)

Thorner, Kerblay, & Smith (eds)

A.V. Chayanov on the Theory
of Peasant Economy

Chayanov's Concept of Peasant Economy

BY DANIEL THORNER

Most of those who are today seeking to understand the economic behavior of the peasantry seem to be unaware that they are traversing much the same ground trod from the 1860's onward by several generations of Russian economists. The problems that are today plaguing economists in countries like Brazil, Mexico, Turkey, Nigeria, India, and Indonesia bear striking similarities to those that were the order of the day in Russia from the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 down to the collectivization of agriculture at the end of the 1920's, to wit:

How to transform traditional rural society so as to overcome the misery, squalor, and illiteracy of the peasantry;

How to get the peasants to modernize their agriculture, especially their farming technique;

How to carry out this transformation and modernization so as to permit—indeed, to facilitate—the development of the entire national economy.

One of the first methods young Russian idealists tried for dealing with these problems was direct action. Hundreds upon hundreds of college students, doctors, nurses, university teachers—including economists and statisticians—quit their urban life and attempted to "go to the people." Establishing themselves in villages, they tried to be of use to the peasantry, to get them into motion; revolutionaries among these idealists preached the virtues of socialism. The police smoked them out and rounded them up, sometimes tipped off by the peasants themselves, suspicious of outsiders from other orders of society.

Chastened by their experiences, many of these action-oriented intellectuals deemed it wise, before undertaking further adventures in rural philanthropy, to obtain a more precise knowledge of village realities. Scores of them offered their services when in the 1870's the new provincial and district assemblies, the zemstvos—set up to help implement the land reforms of 1861—launched a vast program of economic and statistical investigation into peasant economic problems. It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of these field in-

quiries, which continued through four decades down to World War I. In sheer bulk, they add up to more than 4,000 volumes. These constitute perhaps the most ample single source of data we have on the peasant economy of any country in modern times.

More significant than the quantity is the quality of these data. From the outset, the field investigators included some of the ablest men of the day. Sympathetic to the peasantry and anxious to gain insight into their problems, they were determined to carry out their inquiries with utmost thoroughness. In presenting their results, they took great pains to choose suitable categories and to design statistical tables so as to bring out clearly the basic relations among the various economic and social groups in the villages. Some of their reports were so striking that in 1890 the government passed a law forbidding any further inquiries into landlord-peasant relations, but, nonetheless, the work went on.

In the decades from 1880 onward, Russia's leading economists, statisticians, sociologists, and agricultural experts assessed, analyzed, and fought over the materials furnished by the successive zemstvo inquiries. Their articles and books provide the richest analytical literature we have on the peasant economy of any country in the period since the Industrial Revolution. Among the Russian scholars who participated in the debate over the zemstvo statistics, N. A. Kablukov, V. A. Kosinskii, A. N. Chelintsev, N. P. Makarov, and G. A. Studenskii stand out for their attempts to formulate a theory of peasant economy. Alexander Vasilevich Chayanov, from 1919 to 1930 the leading Russian authority on the economics of agriculture, synthesized the theoretical ideas of his predecessors and contemporaries, and developed them along original lines. Translations into English of two studies by Chayanov form the core of the present volume.

The first and by far the larger of these works is Chayanov's masterpiece, *Organizatsiya krest'yanskogo khozyaistva*, the title of which may be rendered in English as *Peasant Farm Organization*. It provides a theory of peasant behavior at the level of the individual family farm, i.e., at the micro level. The second, much shorter study—"Zur Frage einer Theorie der nichtkapitalistischen Wirtschaftssysteme,"¹ which may be translated as "On the Theory of Non-Capitalist Economic Systems"—sets forth the proposition that at the national, or macro, level, peasant economy ought to be treated as an economic system in its own right, as a noncapitalist system of national econ-

omy. The brief remarks that follow will be concerned chiefly with Chayanov's theory of the peasant farm, his micro theory, which Constantin von Dietze has termed the most noteworthy creative synthesis so far achieved in this field down to the present day.²

Chayanov's Theory of the Peasant Farm

The sure and certain way to misunderstand the peasant family farm, Chayanov held, was to view it as a business, that is to say, an enterprise of a capitalistic sort. To him, the essential characteristic of business firms or capitalistic enterprises was that they operated with hired workers in order to earn profits. By contrast, peasant family farms, as Chayanov defined them, normally employed no hired wage labor—none whatsoever. His family farms were pure in the sense that they depended solely on the work of their own family members.

Chayanov's definition of the family farm may surprise us by its narrowness when compared with the much wider usage of the term in recent decades.³ Present-day economists familiar with model building might assume that for his purpose Chayanov framed a special model or ideal type. In fact, Chayanov considered his category a real one drawn from life. He contended that 90 percent or more of the farms in Russia in the first quarter of the twentieth century had no hired laborers, that they were family farms in the full sense of his definition. In so far as his contention was correct, his model was far from being "ideal"; quite the contrary, it stood for the most typical farm in what was then the largest peasant country in the world.

From this starting point, Chayanov proceeded to challenge head on the validity of standard economics for the task of analyzing the economic behavior of peasant farms that relied on family labor only. The prevailing concepts and doctrines of classical and neoclassical economics, he wrote, had been developed to explain the behavior of capitalistic entrepreneurs and business undertakings in which hired hands worked for wages. The economic theory of the behavior of such firms turned on the quantitative interrelationship of wages (of labor), interest (on capital), rent (for land), and profits (of enterprise). To find out whether a given business firm was making a *profit*, it was necessary to set down the value of gross annual output, deduct outlays

¹ C. von Dietze, "Peasantry," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. XII (1934), p. 52; and personal communication from Professor von Dietze, Summer, 1964.

² The term family farm is sometimes even used for capitalistic enterprises producing essentially for export, as long as these are family-operated.

for wages, materials, upkeep, or replacement of capital and other usual expenses, including rent, and then compare the sum left over with the *interest* that might be earned at prevailing rates on the total fixed and circulating capital. These four factors—wages, interest, rent, and profits—operated in close functional interdependence and were reciprocally determined. The moment one of the four factors was absent, it became impossible to establish just what was to be included in each of the remaining three; hence there was no way of determining their magnitudes. Take away any one of the four factors, Chayanov argued, and the whole theoretical structure went awry, like a cart that has lost one wheel. This was precisely what happened, according to Chayanov, when economists tried to apply the analysis in terms of wages, profit, rent, and interest to peasant family farms.

Since peasant family farms had no hired labor, they paid no wages. Accordingly, the economic category "wages" was devoid of content and the economic theory of wages irrelevant to family activity. Carrying the argument further, Chayanov posed the question whether in the absence of wages the net gain, the rent, and the interest on capital could be worked out for such peasant farms. His answer was a flat no. In the absence of wages, these calculations could not be made. Hence, the behavior of these farms could not be accounted for in terms of standard theories of the four main factors of production.

Furthermore, Chayanov saw no validity in circumventing the absence of wage data by imputing values to unpaid family labor. He insisted on taking the entire family household as a single economic unit and treating their annual product minus their outlays as a single return to family activity. By its very nature, this return was unique and indivisible. It could not be meaningfully broken down into wages and the other factor payments of standard economic theory. In Chayanov's view, the return to the peasant family was *undifferentiable*.

Professional economists, Chayanov conceded, would balk at this, for they would somehow prefer, as Alfred Weber had told him in Heidelberg about 1924,⁴ to encompass these family units together with the more tractable business enterprises within a single system, a universal economics, the standard economics on which they had been brought up. Such an attempt, Chayanov insisted, was foredoomed to failure.

⁴ Alfred Weber was the distinguished German economist who, together with Joseph Schumpeter and Emil Lederer, then edited the leading German social science periodical, *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*.

Economists would have to face the fact, he held, that economies made up of family units in which the category of wages was absent belonged to a fundamentally different economic structure and required a different economic theory. Such a theoretical system, he wrote, would have the same relationship to present-day economics as Lobachevskii's geometry bore to that of Euclid. In his day, Lobachevskii gave up the assumption of parallel lines; we would have to drop wages.

Chayanov's own theory—or, if the expression be permitted, his non-Euclidean economics—was not restricted to peasant agricultural production. He was concerned with the total income of the peasant family from agriculture and also from crafts and trades. The economic unit for which his theory was devised was the peasant family taken as a whole in all its works, or, alternatively, the total economic activity of family labor. Thus, he saw his exposition of peasant economy as a particular form of a larger doctrine—the theory of family economy.⁵

The Labor-Consumer Balance

Chayanov's central concept for analyzing family economics was what he called the labor-consumer balance between the satisfaction of family needs and the drudgery (or irksomeness) of labor. Once grasped, this concept furnishes the key to his entire position and mode of presentation. It was one of the chief weapons he wielded in his severe critiques both of Marxian economics in Russia and of orthodox classical and neoclassical economics in the West.

In developing his concept of the labor-consumer balance, Chayanov began with the gross income or gross product of a peasant family household at the end of an agricultural year, assumed to be at a given level (say, 1,000 rubles). From this annual gross income, certain expenses had to be deducted so as to restore the farm to the same level of production it possessed at the beginning of that agricultural year, i.e., seed, fodder, repairs, replacement of expired livestock and worn-out equipment, etc. Once these expenses had been deducted, the family was left with a net product or net income that constituted the return for its labor during that agricultural year. How was that net

⁵ Cf. the title of Chayanov's book in German, *Die Lehre von der bäuerlichen Wirtschaft: Versuch einer Theorie der Familienwirtschaft in Landbau* (*The Theory of Peasant Economy: Test of a Theory of Family Economy in Agriculture*) (Berlin: P. Parey, 1923).

income or net product to be divided among family budget for consumption, capital formation for raising the farm's potential level of production, and savings (if there was any possibility of savings not invested in the farm)? Put more simply, what should the family eat, what fresh capital should it invest in the farm, what should it put by?

A *capitalistic* enterprise, Chayanov pointed out, can get objective, quantitative evidence about how to proceed. By deducting from its gross product the outlays on materials and wages, a business concern can ascertain its net profits. If it wishes to increase its profits, the concern can put in more capital and obtain, in due course, an exact quantitative statement as to the increase, if any, in net profits. For a peasant family farm, however, there are neither wages nor net profits. The family members know roughly how many days they have worked, but Chayanov insisted there is no *valid* way of estimating in money the value of their work. All they can see before them is the net product of their work, and there is no way of dividing days of labor into bushels of wheat.

According to Chayanov, the peasant family proceeds by subjective evaluation based on the long experience in agriculture of the living generation and its predecessors. Most peasant families, Chayanov showed, are in a position either to work more hours or to work more intensively, sometimes even both. The extent to which the members of the family actually work under given conditions he called the degree of self-exploitation of family labor. The peasants would put in greater effort only if they had reason to believe it would yield an increase in output, which could be devoted to greater family consumption, to enlarged investment in the farm, or to both. The mechanism Chayanov devised for explaining how the family acted is his labor-consumer balance. Each family, he wrote, seeks an annual output adequate for its basic needs; but this involves drudgery, and the family does not push its work beyond the point where the possible increase in output is outweighed by the irksomeness of the extra work. Each family strikes a rough balance or equilibrium between the degree of satisfaction of family needs and the degree of drudgery of labor.

In itself, Chayanov hastened to add, there was nothing novel or remarkable about this concept. What is of interest and gives value to Chayanov's book is the way he handled the concept. He showed how for different families the balance between consumer satisfaction and degree of drudgery is affected by the size of the family and the ratio of working members to nonworking members. He traced the

"natural history" of the family from the time of marriage of the young couple through the growth of the children to working age and marriage of this second generation. In relating this natural history of the family to the changing size of peasant farms from generation to generation, Chayanov developed the concept of "demographic differentiation," which he asked his readers to contrast with the Marxian concept of class differentiation among the peasantry.

But his analysis is far from being primarily demographic. Using the bases of the zemstvo statistics, the studies of these by his predecessors and colleagues, and fresh field inquiries, Chayanov examined the effects on the labor-consumer balance of a wide range of factors. He took account of size of holdings, qualities of soil, crops grown, livestock, manure, location, market prices, land prices, interest rates on capital loans, feasibility of particular crafts and trades, availability of alternative work, and relative density of population. Chayanov was not so much concerned with the individual effects of each of these factors as with their mutual effects as they changed through time.

In weighing the influence of these *several* elements on the delicate balance between urgency of family needs and drudgery of labor, Chayanov employed some of the concepts and techniques of marginal utility analysis. His terminology included, for example, demand satisfaction and marginal expenditure of work force. For factors not subject to any precise measurement, such as willingness to put in greater efforts, he constructed equilibrium graphs showing interaction under varying assumptions.

Chayanov foresaw, quite correctly, that his use of these tools of "bourgeois" economics would shock many of his contemporaries in Soviet Russia of the mid-1920's. He countered that his work should be judged not by the genealogy of his techniques but, rather, by the results he had been able to obtain through the application of those techniques to the Russian data in the light of economic postulates firmly anchored in peasant behavior.

Summing up his findings, Chayanov wrote that "available income was divided according to the equilibrium of production and consumption evaluations or, more accurately, a desire to maintain a constant level of well-being."⁶ Generally speaking, an increase in family gross income led to increases in both family budget and capital forma-

⁶ See below, p. 218. For an earlier discussion of a balance between "need" and "labor," see W. Stanley Jevons, *The Theory of Political Economy* (4th ed.; London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1911), chap. v.

tion. The precise way the gross income was divided up in each family was a question of subjective judgment by the head of the family and, hence, could not be expressed in objective, quantitative terms.

According to Chayanov, the basic characteristics of the peasant family's economic behavior fundamentally differed from those of capitalist farm owner's in price they were prepared to pay for buying land, interest they were willing to pay in borrowing capital, rent they would pay for leasing in land, price at which they would sell their produce, etc. In conditions where capitalist farms would go bankrupt, peasant families could work longer hours, sell at lower prices, obtain no net surplus, and yet manage to carry on with their farming, year after year. For these reasons, Chayanov concluded that the competitive power of peasant family farms versus large-scale capitalist farms was much greater than had been foreseen in the writings of Marx, Kautsky, Lenin, and their successors.

Viability of Peasant Family Farms

In proclaiming the viability of peasant family farming, Chayanov set himself against the mainstreams of Marxist thought in Russia and western Europe. Marx had termed the peasant who hires no labor a kind of twin economic person: "As owner of the means of production he is capitalist, as worker he is his own wage worker." What is more, Marx added, "the separation between the two is the normal relation in this [i.e., capitalist] society." According to the law of the increasing division of labor in society, small-scale peasant agriculture must inevitably give way to large-scale capitalist agriculture. In Marx's own words:

... [the] peasant who produces with his own means of production will either gradually be transformed into a small capitalist who also exploits the labor of others, or he will suffer the loss of his means of production ... and be transformed into a wage worker. This is the tendency in the form of society in which the capitalist mode of production predominates.⁷

Marx and Engels believed that the advantages of concentration and centralization lay with the capitalist farmers who would, in the course of time, swallow up the small peasants. Two outstanding followers of Marx who adhered to this position were Kautsky, whose mono-

graph, *Die Agrarfrage*, was published in Stuttgart in 1899, and Lenin, whose work, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, appeared later in the same year in Moscow. The analyses by Kautsky for western Europe and Lenin for tsarist Russia were each sharply challenged in a large body of literature. It is out of the question for us to discuss these works here.⁸ Of interest to us is that Chayanov rejected both the terms in which Marx analyzed the peasant farm and the assessment by Lenin of the importance of family farms in the Russian economy of his time.

At the outset of his book on *Peasant Farm Organization*, Chayanov assailed the characterization of the peasant as having a twofold nature, combining in himself the attributes of both a capitalist and a wage worker. Chayanov termed this bifurcation an unhelpful fiction—what is worse, a purely "capitalist" kind of fiction in the sense that it was made up entirely of capitalist categories and was conceivable only within a capitalist system. For understandable reasons, Chayanov did not explicitly state that he was criticizing Marx. It was all too easy, however, for anyone familiar with what Marx wrote, or with what Lenin wrote about Marx, to discern who was at least one of Chayanov's targets.⁹

Chayanov's position vis-à-vis Marx, it should be noted, was not altogether his own creation but reflected the cumulative work of the Organization and Production School of Russian agricultural economists onward from the time of Kosinskii's 1905 treatise. A neat statement of the position of this group can be found in the well-known

⁸ Even before the appearance of Kautsky's book, the position and policy of the German Socialists with regard to the small peasantry had given rise to sharp dispute within the party. Some of the original documents are conveniently assembled and translated into English by R. C. K. Ensor in his useful collection, *Modern Socialism* (2d ed.; London and New York: Harper and Bros., 1907), especially items xv, xvi, and xxii. Convenient discussions of the controversy in central and western Europe are given in the works by A. Gerschenkron, *Bread and Democracy in Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1943), and in George Lichtheim, "Kautsky," *Marxism* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), chap. v. For the controversy in tsarist Russia, see Kerblay's article below, pp. xxviii–xxx.

⁹ Where Chayanov found Marx in agreement with him, he of course did not hesitate to quote him by name. Thus, he cites both in Chap. 5 and in Chap. 6 the celebrated passage in which Marx states: ". . . with parcellated farming and small scale landed property . . . production to a very great extent satisfies own needs and is carried out independently of control by the general (i.e., the capitalist) rate of profit." See below, Chap. 5, p. 222 and Chap. 6, p. 240.

It should be noted that in the 1870's Marx learned Russian primarily in order to read the zemstvo reports on the peasantry. He followed these closely and, as was his habit, took extensive notes. Three volumes of these notes have been translated into Russian and published, and a fourth has been announced. See the *Arkhiv Marks'a i Engel'sa* (Moscow, 1948, 1952, and 1955), Vols. XI, XII, and XIII.

⁷ Marx, *Theorien über den Mehrwert*, in the translation of G. A. Bonner and Emile Burns, *Theories of Surplus Value* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1951), pp. 193–94.

treatise on *The Accumulation of Capital* by Rosa Luxemburg, the most dynamic force in German socialism in the period of World War I. Luxemburg had been born in Poland under tsarist rule and was thoroughly familiar with Russian literature on the peasantry.

It is an empty abstraction [she wrote] to apply simultaneously all the categories of capitalistic production to the peasantry, to conceive of the peasant as his own entrepreneur, wage labourer and landlord all in one person. The economic peculiarity of the peasantry, if we want to put them . . . into one undifferentiated category, lies in the very fact that they belong neither to the class of capitalist entrepreneurs nor to that of the wage proletariat, that they do not represent capitalistic production but simple commodity production.¹⁰

Chayanov's differences with Lenin were, if anything, even sharper than his divergences from Marx. As early as 1899, Lenin had written that in Russian agriculture the capitalist farmers—the peasant bourgeoisie—were already in the saddle. They were in a small minority, Lenin wrote, perhaps no more than 20 percent of the farm households. Nonetheless, in terms of the total quantity of means of production, and in terms of their share of total produce grown, "the peasant bourgeoisie are predominant. They are the masters of the countryside."¹¹

By what criteria did Lenin separate capitalist farmers from non-capitalist peasants? In his view, the decisive step toward capitalism came when laborers had to be hired, when ". . . the areas cultivated by the well-to-do peasants exceed the family labor norm (i.e., the amount of land a family can cultivate by its own labor), and compel them to resort to the hiring of workers. . . ."¹² For Lenin, the hiring of workers had become widespread, and Russia was well on its way toward a capitalist agriculture with a peasant bourgeoisie and a rural proletariat. Chayanov's numerous references to the very small part hired laborers played on Russian farms (e.g., his assertion that 90 percent had no hired laborers in the period 1900–1925) constitute, therefore, a direct, if implicit, refutation of Lenin.¹³ In fact, Chayanov's

¹⁰ Rosa Luxemburg, *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals* (Berlin, 1913, as reprinted in 1928), p. 368. I have followed the English translation of 1951, *The Accumulation of Capital* (London: Routledge, 1951), but have made it more literal.

¹¹ V. I. Lenin, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956), pp. 177–78.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 52.

¹³ See below, p. 112.

whole approach—his selection of the pure family farm as the typical Russian unit, his insistence on the survival power of such family farms, and his treatment of rural differentiation in terms of demographic cycles rather than class antagonisms—was diametrically opposed to that of Lenin.

Wider Relevance of Chayanov's Theory

Chayanov's micro theory, as he was able to elaborate it before his career was cut short, is essentially a theory of one kind of individual family farm in Russia—the family farm that employs no hired labor whatsoever. There were other kinds of peasant farms in Russia, and there were capitalist farms as well. Once we step out of Russia we find peasant family farms elsewhere in Europe and in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Chayanov's theory was devised to take account of Russian conditions, where the kind of peasant family farm that he discussed was predominant. Does his micro theory apply to peasant family farms in other countries?

Chayanov himself conceded that his theory worked better for thinly populated countries than for densely populated ones.¹⁴ It also worked better in countries where the agrarian structure had been shaken up (as in Russia after the emancipation of the serfs in 1861) than in countries with a more rigid agrarian structure. Where the peasants could not readily buy or take in more land, his theory would have to be seriously modified.¹⁵

Since Chayanov did not work out these modifications, he did not elaborate a full-blown theory of peasant family farming for any country other than Russia. Nonetheless, he indicated that he thought one single universal theory of the peasant family farm at the micro level could be devised. In his view, the Russian case, which he developed so fully, was only an illustration of this larger theory.

One wonders whether he may not have been overoptimistic about the possibility of a universal micro theory of peasant family farming. We will recall that in calculating the springs of peasant decisions in Russia Chayanov took account of the interaction of a very large number of factors, including family size and structure, land tenures, climate, access to markets, and possibility of getting extra jobs in off-seasons. He was able to construct his models more easily, since he

¹⁴ See below, p. 111.

¹⁵ See below, p. 112.

assumed the existence of a single "pure" type of family farm, free of hired wage labor. Extending the theory outside Russia would at the very least involve preparation of alternative models for "impure" peasant households employing hired labor.

Although it encompassed a very wide range of possibilities, Chayanov's theory of peasant farming remained essentially a static one. From the 1860's through the 1920's, the Russian agricultural economy underwent a rapid series of fundamental changes. There were marked sectoral and regional differences in rates of growth. Chayanov often referred to the existence of these differentials, but pitched his theory at a level of abstraction well above them.

With regard to the broader institutional framework, Chayanov was fond of saying that capitalism was only one particular economic system. There had been others known to history, and perhaps more were to come in the future. In his 1924 article, the title of which we have translated as "On the Theory of Non-Capitalist Economic Systems," Chayanov cites six major kinds of economies. Three of these are familiar—capitalism, slavery, and communism. The fourth, "family economy," Chayanov divided into two subtypes—"natural" economy and "commodity" economy. These two names may be taken as roughly equivalent to "self-subsistent" and "market-oriented." In Chayanov's two additional categories—the "serf economy" of tsarist Russia and the "feudal economy" of medieval western Europe—the "commodity" economy of the lords was superimposed on the "natural" economy of the peasants. The chief difference between the two systems, according to his schema, was that in Russia the peasants worked on their own fields but had to make payments in kind to the lord, whereas in the West the peasants had to put in certain days of work directly on the home farm of the lord. Both of these lord-and-peasant systems were essentially symbiotic mixtures of the two subtypes within the basic category "family economy." In effect, therefore, Chayanov postulated only four major systems—capitalism, slavery, communism, and family economy.

Will one universal economics, Chayanov asked, suffice for all these systems? One could be erected, he conceded, but at the price of containing only vague and lofty abstractions about scarcity and optimization. That would scarcely be worth the trouble. Properly speaking, each separate system required its own theory, its own body of theoretical economics. Each such theory should explain the functioning of the economy at the aggregate level, i.e., the economics of the nations or states falling within its purview.

The major system with which Chayanov was most familiar was, of course, the family economy of his native Russia. He referred repeatedly to his desire to show the significance of agriculture based on peasant family farming for the entire Russian *national* economy. In the Introduction to his book, *Peasant Farm Organization*, he announced his intention to go into the subject thoroughly at a later date, but he does not seem to have found the time to do so. Hence, we do not have from him any systematic exposition of his theory of family economy at the national level, nor any case study of the economic functioning of a predominantly peasant country taken as a whole. Nonetheless, we find scattered through his works many suggestive remarks on peasant economy at the national level.

When Chayanov was arrested in 1930, together with a number of his colleagues, his research teams were dispersed. The most fertile and sophisticated group of scholars then working in any country on peasant economy was shattered. The quality of Chayanov's writings from 1911 to 1930 permits us to believe that had he been able to continue with his scientific work he would have contributed even more significantly to the understanding of peasant economic behavior both in and out of Russia.