

this land is now prohibited indirectly by State law. This way, the bourgeois State rids itself of the need for explicit discriminatory slogans like the ones used in the Yishuv phase to live up to the twin labor Zionist principles "conquest of land" and "Hebrew labor".

It is important here to try to understand why the Yishuv institutions (often referred to as the formative elements of the State), which are worldwide in scope and which were created to develop a material "base" for the Jewish State "superstructure", remained operative after the establishment of the State; and even became organs of the State itself.

This combined institutional structure and content of the State of Israel makes it a complex one of a dual character: both an Israeli and Jewish State, and simultaneously national and world-wide. Perhaps this dual design is the only way that there can be a Jewish State that is to serve all the Jewish bourgeoisie, both in Diaspora and in Israel itself.

It is not the place here to treat this question in any meaningful way. It may, however, be treated later in this thesis. What we must point out here is that, in effect, this dual institutional character of the State superstructure enables the State of Israel to channel the means of production into exclusively Jewish use, denying its Palestinian-Arab citizens access to resources without explicit violation of the bourgeois democratic traditions to which it explicitly adheres.

Concrete examples on how this actually works are abundant in a study by Ian Lustick entitled "Institutionalized Segmentation: One Factor in the Control of Israeli Arabs."¹¹³

Until now, we have emphasized only the methods and institutional arrangements of land acquisition during the nation-building phase. We have