

nance of the political instance to that of the economic, on the one hand, and from the dominance of the sectarian tendency in Labor-Zionism to that of the secular.

The doves are concerned more with preserving the Jewish character of the State of Israel and therefore advocate the return of the populated territories, as they represent a threat to the imperative of Jewish demographic superiority. They object to the integration of Arab labor into productive employment by Israeli-Jewish capital, believing that it gives Israel a racist character and reduces its proletarian settler-colonialism, which does not exploit but rather expels and replaces native labor, into a classical secular settler-colonialism. This is the conservative view characterized by a pre-monopoly conception of the Jewish State.

Hawks like Dayan and Peres advocate, to the contrary, annexation of the occupied territories and exploitation of Palestinian labor. Political (demographic and security) considerations are overridden by economic ones. Their views express the subordination of Labor-Zionism's sectarian tendency to its secular tendency in the face of the essential internationalization of local capital. The hawks, therefore, favor transformation in the sense of secularization of the Jewish settler-colonial formation. What is it that compels this faction in the hegemonic power bloc to advocate positions that are pregnant with what is believed to be security and political risks? To answer this question, it is necessary to identify the fraction of ruling class (i.e., the source of capital) they represent! It is our thesis that the hawkish position represents the political articulation of local private capital and its urge to integrate less-developed forms of production and subordinate them to the requirements of its extended reproduction in the