

sciousness; the idea of a bourgeois Jewish State. In this sense, the distinction between bourgeois Zionism and Labor, socialist or proletarian Zionism is false also. The difference between the socialist/proletarian Zionism and other formulas is a strategic one, concerning the implementation strategy by which the Zionist idea - bourgeois Jewish State - can be actualized.

We also try to demonstrate that the distinction between left-wing and right-wing Labor-Zionism is irrelevant in the sense that Borochovism, the extreme left of Labor-Zionism, is objectively bourgeois.

(c) We argue further that the only development strategy for the implementation of the Zionist idea was Borochovism. There were proposals regarding the territory in which the Jewish State was to be established (Herzl) but none other than Borochov provided a theory of action, a development strategy based on a systematic understanding of the material prerequisites for the existence of a State which is essentially bourgeois and Jewish.

(d) That the Borochovist strategy was bourgeois in character, it can lead only to development on capitalist lines. This can be so independently of its architect's intention and for that matter of his class origin and position subject to class struggle, not to metaphysical determinants.

Further, it can be so independently of the paradigm to which it explicitly adheres. Also, independently of the terminology and methodology incorporated in its formulation. It can also be bourgeois independently of the fact that it had a petty bourgeois appearance and thus appealed to and mobilized the petty bourgeoisie, not the bourgeoisie. By the latter, we mean that the Jewish petty bourgeoisie had falsely adopted Zionism and