

happened then to be in coincidence with the needs of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie. This coincidence, however, must not be taken to signify commonality of class interests. As a matter of fact, the interests of the two classes were contradictory: the class interest of the Jewish bourgeoisie lay in monopoly formation, while the very survival of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie as a social class threatened to extinction by the formation of monopoly capital. This argument is the subject of Chapter II.

Two points are to be concluded from Zionism: first, that a class alliance which belongs to the sphere of conjunctural class positions can transform the class location which is structurally determined and hence affect the class interest. This seems to contradict a point made earlier regarding the undissolving of class or class fraction into one another through alliance. It may be a feature peculiar to settler-colonialism. This point, however, may be taken to highlight the dialectics of the subjective and the objective forces in the development process: how specific material conditions give rise to particular forms of consciousness and how consciousness can then become a mobilizing material force and transform the initial material conditions from which it arises.

Second, that alliances between classes that do not share common class interests are necessarily conjunctural, as they do not resolve objective contradictions inherent in their distinct class interests which fix the horizon of the class' struggle, given that classes exist only in class struggle.

In other words, alliances of classes that share no commonality of class interests represents necessarily a contradictory unity. The objec-