

relations of production which makes labor itself into a commodity; and this determines the generalization of the commodity form.

This raises again the question regarding the inconceivability of the proletarianization of Israeli-Jews, given that a Jew is automatically entitled to the use of land, the property of the Jewish State, and by definition has an inalienable right to land possession. Unlike the Palestinian-Arabs, for Israeli-Jews mobility and/or immobility off the land is ultimately a matter of choice; laboring productively as manual, non-supervisory wage earners is thus still a matter of choice. Does the latter, therefore, objectively signify an actual proletarianization?

Unlike the question raised earlier regarding the inconceivability of a settler-colonial proletariat, this question relates specifically to the Zionist settler-colonial context, distinguished by its unsecular character. Both questions, however, point out a conjunctural conflict between the laws of capital accumulation and the laws of Zionist colonization. The former are most likely to enforce the secularization of the Jewish State. This is probably linked to the victory of the Likud against Yadin's Movement for Change in the recent elections. The former, with their allies the fanatic religious orthodoxy, are the most committed to rescuing the Jewish State from secularization through capitalist transformation. Their success to do so will inevitably result in the rise of fascism.

To sum up this point is to point out the unsecular character of the superstructure as an objective impediment for Israeli-Jewish-Palestinian-Arab proletariat alliance. The secularization of the "base" theoretically transforms the superstructure, resulting therefore, in turn, in material conditions more favorable to such alliances.