

tion and embourgeoisement as the dual social aspects of the capitalist accumulation process, in reality proletarianization is not accompanied by embourgeoisement within all social formations (a local proletariat co-existing with a correlative local bourgeoisie), and it does not always involve the entire mass of immediate producers. This depends on the historical specificity of the particular social formation and its relation to the internationally hegemonic capital. It also depends on the extent to which proletarianization results merely from the penetration of capital or also from the generalization of the capitalist relations of production. Put differently, proletarianization does necessarily presuppose capitalist relations of production, but it is not peculiar to capitalist social formations.

The development of capitalism in metropolitan countries, for example, resulted in the liquidization of the peasantry as a social class, and the proletarianization of almost the entire mass of immediate producers (except for some petty commodity producers who, being threatened by proletarianization, immigrated to settle "new" lands: the United States, Australia, South Africa, Palestine, etc.). Because accumulation of capital in the metropolis occurred under the generalization of the capitalist mode of production, effecting the polarization of society into capitalists and modern wage-workers as the principal classes and social forces within those social formations, they became capitalist social formations. A capitalist social formation exists when capitalist relations are generalized in the form of local proletariat and bourgeoisie. After colonialism, the reproduction of these relations, in turn, urges the integration and subordination of pre-capitalist social formation. A feature of monopoly capitalism, this integration distorts the previously dominant relations in the latter, and their