

tion, inherent in the combination of opposites of: socialist appearance and capitalist essence. In retrospect, the kibbutz in its concrete form and real experience refutes the essential unity of Zionism and socialism claimed by Borochof, the founding father of Labor-Zionism. It highlights the essential antagonism between socialism as a proletariat alternative, and Zionism, being ultimately a bourgeois alternative.

This is different from arguing about the kibbutz' internal contradictions as being a function of incongruities between its intrinsically socialist character and the essentially capitalist environment into which it was transplanted. The latter argument is misleading; it is historically inaccurate, in the sense of misinterpreting the actual role of the kibbutz in the creation of a settler-colonial social formation, and precisely in the formation of Jewish social classes -- using Borochof's term -- in the "normalization" of the Jewish society of Diaspora, which consisted of a "one-people class", as Abram Leon documents.

This is different, also, from arguing that the contradictions facing the kibbutz today are the result of inconsistencies between the theory and practice of socialist Zionism, or the effects of Statehood, which has centralized the Jewish socio-economic existence in Palestine, resulting finally in the current bankruptcy of the kibbutz. The kibbutz, we emphasize again, must be viewed in the proper historical context, in terms of its role in the creation of a Jewish social formation in Palestine and not in isolation from the latter. In this sense, the kibbutz community, which formed the core of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie in Palestine, played a major role in the development of a Jewish social formation and, currently, in the formation of Jewish proletariat and bourgeoisie; this is to say, in furthering