

the Moshava, were also masked.

Various authors argue that the Zionist control of Palestine nationalized or even socialized all relations of production. This claim is not only made with regard to the co-operative forms, but also refers to the private settlements of the Rothschilds. It is argued that with the development of the Zionist movement, the conflict between the capitalists and the Zionist socialists was resolved with the triumph of "socialist Zionism" over capitalism. As a good will gesture on the part of Rothschild, it is maintained, his property was totally transferred to the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association (P.I.C.A) and consequently fell under the control of the Jewish Agency.

A closer examination of this "transfer", however, reveals a different situation. Data suggest that control over the Rothschild's settlements passed only temporarily to P.I.C.A. This was during the four year period of 1920-24, after which the Baron returned to Palestine and assumed full control over his property.

More importantly, the conflict between the Rothschilds and representatives from the the Jewish Agency was not one between the adherents of capitalism and the adherents of socialism. It was not between capitalists and anti-capitalists, as some authors suggest (Kimmerling,1983; Ohana,1981; Eisenstadt,1985). On the contrary, it was between two sections within the Jewish bourgeoisie; on the one hand the Jewish Agency represented by big investors like Etinger, Goldberg and Usishkin who themselves occupied high political posts within the Agency, (23) and on the other, the Baron who owned most of the Moshavot.