

tal, namely, Jewish capitalist relations of production; i.e., Jewish class struggle, specifically Jewish antagonism between a Jewish proletariat and a Jewish bourgeoisie as the material prerequisites for a State which is Jewish and bourgeois. It is for this emphasis on exclusive Jewish proletarianization and class struggle that it is often interpreted as proletarian in character, and we argue that it is precisely for these reasons that it is bourgeois in character.

We further argue that it is precisely in this task that it is precisely this strategy that derives from dialectical materialism. From the formal structure of the Marxist conception of the rise of the bourgeois State, but transposed to utterly different conditions from those depicted in the historical materialist account of the rise of the bourgeois social formation. In effect, Borochoy was seeking to simulate a process of development using insights of a dialectical materialist kind.

This analysis of Borochoy's socialist or proletarian Zionism provides for a different interpretation of the emphasis on replacing, as opposed to exploiting, the indigenous labor force which is said to distinguish Jewish colonial settlement in Palestine from other cases of settler-colonialism (say, South Africa), and which has special bearing on the proletarianization of Palestinians in the past. It also sheds a new light on the underlying causes of Palestinian proletarianization in the present. In the following, we try to show how Borochoyism constitutes a development plan for Israel's sectarian settler-colonial social formation, as a necessary background for identifying current formations that are related to the proletarianization of Palestinians in Israel today.