

ranging from the primitive to the competitive, but not politically into monopoly. However, this mutual exclusiveness lies in the material requirements for the emergence of a nation-state which is bourgeois and Jewish. The twin slogans mentioned above are derivatives of the proletarian Zionist ideology. The ideological seems the most explicit and occupies the place of dominance (over the political and economic) in Borochovism. It is always the economic that determines which of the three instances to be dominant in a particular conjuncture. Here we see clearly how it is not at all accidental that the ideological is dominant even in theory (and not only in practice, as demonstrated in the following chapter) during the pre-Statehood phase of Jewish colonial settlement in Palestine. The dominance of the economic or the political would have inevitably exposed the proletarian mythology and unravelled the bourgeois aspirations inherent in Borochovism. Mobilization on the basis of "proletarian" ideology seems even theoretically essential for the realization of the economic and the political of a truly bourgeois program.

Borochov is very conscious of the perfect conditions for the capitalization of middle and petty Jewish capital; Jewish proletarianization is seen as one of the conditions for, and consequences of, such forms of capitalization: "Jewish immigration is slowly tending to direct itself to a country where petty Jewish capital and labor may be utilized in such forms of production as will serve a transition from an urban to an agricultural economy and from production of consumer goods to more basic forms of industry." 101

Implicitly, Borochov advocates for the first phase a balanced capitalist development scale, which guarantees the capitalization of petty Jewish capital, on the one hand, yet within the boundaries of Jewish sectarianism, on the other; a development model which is uneven enough to steer-up class struggle and give rise to a bourgeois state, yet, even enough to guarantee