

Authors argue that land in the co-operatives was not privately owned, thus concluding that land was collectively or communally owned. Moreover, they claim that wage labour was in principle forbidden in the co-operatives, hence strengthening further their contention that the co-operatives were socialist or even communist.

### Landed Property and the Mode of Production

Instead of finding out who actually owned and controlled the land and how land was distributed to members of the co-operatives, most authors assumed that private property within the Zionist settlements was absent and consequently concluded that the means of production in these settlements were socialized. As a result, in the vast majority of the literature the Kibbutz is described as an example of "workers control and ownership of the means of production" (25) or as an egalitarian society of "total equality among its members" (Spencer, 1981:171). The term "communistic society" is often used (Viteles, 1944; Spiro, 1973; Bettelheim, 1971).

This literature suffers from a major theoretical flaw. It fails to show why the form of landed property necessarily indicates a specific mode of production.

In fact there is no necessary correspondence between the form of landed property and the mode of production. Capitalism can be introduced through non-capitalist forms of land-holding, as a consequence which may or may not have been intended. Whether landed property was private, individual, state owned or communally possessed, it must be stressed, capitalism at all stages of its development is capable of penetrating the agrarian economy.

All forms of property, Saleh maintains, are capable of providing