

fertile soil for capitalist development."There is no contradiction," he argues, "between state property and agricultural capitalism" (Saleh,1979:29) Thus what is important here is not the form of land holding but rather the mode in which land is exploited and the purpose for which crops are produced.

Production in the Moshavs and the Kibbutzim was not organized on the principle of self sufficiency of their members. Members did not produce use value but rather commodities, the exchange value of which was realized by the members only after it circulated in the market.

At the empirical level however, one must also consider the question of who owns and/or controls the means of production in these settlements. Land in the co-operatives it should be stressed, was to a large extent owned privately by the Jewish Agency or its settlements, institutions. What was absent was not private ownership but rather individual ownership by members of the co-operatives.

Moreover, the means of production, that is other than land, in these settlements were not as most authors believe, owned and controlled by their members. In fact the Keren Kayemet,(Jewish National Fund), an arm of the Jewish Agency was the sole owner of land capital and technology in the co-operatives. The Keren Kayemet advanced capital in the form of land and other means of production and expected payments in return. Recipients of capital advancements made by the Keren Kayemet particularly within the Kibbutzim had to meet certain economic and, even more importantly, political requirements.

The Keren Kayemet was by no means a public or socialist body at odds with private property. The Keren Kayemet was partly funded by