

In this form of employment outside one's own kibbutz, the employees at best mobilize revenue but do not contribute to the accumulation process in their own kibbutz. In kibbutz Nirim, however, they seem to perform capitalist productive and most likely manual non-supervisory social forms of labor. Unlike the former example, in this case the wage earning kibbutznics are closer to proletariat class-location. But can they belong to the working class while they still, as members of kibbutz Magen, exercise an economic ownership or possession over some means of production. They are not separated from their means of labor, at least land, even in the worst situation, say for instance, their own kibbutz industry going bankrupt.

It is this latter example that may lead to the questioning of the theoretical inconceivability of the proletarianization of kibbutznic labor force, and it is to this situation that the latter conceptualization by Olin Wright may be applied.

In such cases, does not the Magen community constitute merely the shell of a kibbutz reality? Does not it liken a "Bantu", a communal semi-subsistence community whose primary function is to reproduce labor power to be productively utilized in another collective capitalist enterprise (kibbutz Nirim)? Does this differ from the "big fish swallowing the little" in the process of capital accumulation being inevitably also a process of concentration? Does not this phenomenon also simulate the essential unevenness of capitalist transformation and the inseparability of development and underdevelopment in capitalist accumulation?

Manpower merger in the case of these two kibbutzim, which is becoming a common practice among all kibbutzim, seems clearly to simulate, both contradictory location between the petty bourgeoisie and proletariat in the