colonial relationship in Wolpe's analysis is the elaboration of a system of control at the ideological level. Thus the conservation of the non-capitalist (peasant and tribal) modes require the development of

(an ideology) and political policies which revolve around the segregation, and preservation and control of African 'tribal' societies. The ideological focus, it must be stressed, is always necessarily on the 'racial' or 'tribal' or 'national' elements, precisely because of the 'tribal' nature of what is being preserved and controlled (Wolpe, 1975:249).

This conception of 'internal colonialism' has been criticized because of its close approximation to the simplistic, and outdated, notion of functional dualism prevalent in the 1950s and 1960s, by which a traditional rural sector feeds and supports a modernistic sector integrated into the world market (Goodman and Redclift, 1981:50). It should be noted, however, that the notion of preserving a pre-capitalist mode of production and the appropriation of its subsidized labour (by the peasant household) is neither peculiar to apartheid-type conditions, nor is it essential to conceptualize within the confines of the 'internal colonialism' model. As we shall see below, it has become part of the controversy over the location of peasant household production in the transition debate to capitalist agriculture (Patnaik, 1978; Banaji, 1978; and others), and also over the contemporary definition of the peasant producer in the process of proletarianization. I might add that the utility of the 'internal colonialism model' in a system of structured integration becomes more limited in a society in which the main antagonism is one involving class conflict (whether racially 'masked' or otherwise). However, in the relationship that prevails today between Israel and the agrarian sector in the Palestinian (and possibly southern Lebanese) territories, it has important heuristic significance. consolidation of a labour market based on the disenfranchised commuting