

Since class struggle occupies such a centrality in Borochovism and distinguishes it from all other postulates of Zionism, and gives Borochovism its socialist mask, it is imperative for our analysis to re-examine and unravel the real context of the class struggle that Borochov attaches to his Zionism.

(a) The Borochovist Notion of Class Struggle:

Correctly identifying class struggle as the means to achieve both Zionism and socialism, Borochov incorrectly concludes the essential unity of the latter. There is an essential difference in the content of class struggle peculiar to each of the two contexts. The difference is not merely between an engineered class struggle proposed for the realization of Zionism, for giving rise to a bourgeois State, and an historical class struggle emerging from an already existing social formation, not from a potential one yet to be established. The main difference is, indeed, between class struggle in the pursuit of a bourgeois State, as in Borochov's Zionism, and class struggle in the pursuit of a proletarian alternative, that is, for imposing the dictatorship of the proletariat, culminating in the withering away of the State.

The notion of class struggle claimed to distinguish Borochovism as a socialist Zionism is precisely the notion that, in actuality, distinguishes Borochovism as capitalist Zionism, and more accurately, as scientific capitalist Zionism, that derives precisely from historical materialism. Yes, Borochovism is the scientific approach to the development of a bourgeois Jewish State, the key to which is Jewish class struggle which can only exist in a Jewish social formation dominated by a capitalist mode of production. Borochovism is invertedly derived from historical materialism; specifically, from the Marxist theory of the State. It provides the prescription which guarantees the definitional viability of the State-to-be as Jewish and as bourgeois,