

blame Statehood for undermining the genuinely socialist Jewish order in Palestine, as proponents of Borochovism often argue.

As Poulantzas indicates: "The traditional petty bourgeoisie has often been a pillar of the 'democratic republican' order and essential component of left-wing Jacobinism or even petty bourgeois socialism..."⁷³

In his critique of the Gotha Programme (in 1875) of the Socialist Democratic Working Party of Germany, founded by Lassalle, and of French Proudhonism, Marx points out the petty bourgeois, non-proletarian character of these programs, as they have no mention of the dictatorship of the proletariat; that is, the political transition period from State to no-State.⁷⁴

With this position in mind, how can one then consider Borochovism a proletarian ideology and program when it was nothing but a development model for guaranteeing the evolutionary emergence and reproducibility of a bourgeois Jewish State by means of Jewish labor. While proletarian socialism aspires precisely for the withering-away of the state, proletarian Zionism is precisely the very strategy for realizing the idea of a bourgeois state, even with a sectarian character.

C. The Instrumentality of Labor in Zionism

The essence of this essay is to point out the Borochovist genius in recognizing the imperative of labor, hence class struggle, for the realization of Zionism. We recognize the fact that this labor strategy for implementing the Zionist idea, the State, is truly derived from a materialist conception of history. We emphasize it is neither Borochov's definition of the Jewish question nor his territorialist solution to it that derive from a genuine materialist conception of history; it is only his implementation strategy