

tarianization of Palestinian peasants at a later stage was already foreseen as early as Borochoy. This quote, therefore, reinforces our argument that the proletarianization was bourgeois in character. This, however, does not negate the possibility that it was meant to be proletarian also in character; neither does it negate the fact that it was taken to signify, and internalized by, segments of the Jewish people as such.

The debates inside the moshav and the Labor Party are very indicative of the conflict between this outlived sectarian aspect of the Labor-Zionist ideology and the new material conditions characteristic of the post-1967 era. It is interesting to see the role of the social scientists and intellectuals (Bor Yosef, Tolmon, etc.) in their attempt to reproduce and reactivate this outlived ideology of the past in the face of a forceful social change.

This historical review of the relationship between the actual historical practices of proletarian Zionism, specifically the attempt to implement the imperative of exclusive Jewish proletarianization and class struggle, on the one hand, and the proletarianization of Palestinians, on the other, suggests that the latter follows as an objective contradiction from the former. This is different from and even refutes the static view that Palestinian proletarianization in Israel contradicts socialist or Labor-Zionism. This apparent logical contradiction is irrelevant to the dialectical materialist perspective.

It is important to identify and comprehend the objective contradiction inherent in Labor or proletarian Zionism, the unity of materially contradictory tendencies, namely, that it is not only capitalist in character, but also sectarian. This review leads us to examine the proletarian-