

ianization, as Jewish wage-labor requires "free" Jewish labor, utterly separated from the means of subsistence, specifically land. The conquest of land eliminates the condition for Jewish proletarianization, for Jewish wage-labor, namely free labor, as we explained earlier. It also increases the competitiveness of the native labor for capitalist exploitation.

Self-labor-based co-operatives again reduce the intensity of this contradiction. Land can be conquered collectively to house the "labor sector" alone, but not the mass of modern wage workers. This, in turn, promotes the development of utopian forms of living (kibbutz, moshav) as incentives for Aliyah, furthering Jewish settlement.

The contradictions inherent in the strategic objectives of Labor-Zionism are thus accommodated through its inner tactical consistency and flexibility. Perhaps it is precisely in this tactical flexibility, inherent in the nature of the strategy itself, that the secret for the mobilizing force of Borochovist Labor-Zionist strategy lies; it provided the displaced Jewish petty bourgeoisie, threatened by extinction as a class (on the verge of proletarianization or marginalization), with three alternatives: (1) embourgeoisement by assuring Jewish wage-labor; (2) restoration of their petty bourgeois class-location by assuring the possibility of land and self-labor; (3) secure proletarianization by Jewish capital by eliminating the threat of a more competitive labor, and above all, proletarianization for a cause, Zionism.

These premises, implicit in the Borochovist formulation of the labor strategy for the actualization of Zionism, are very insightfully derived from the material conditions of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie in Diaspora and from the conditions in the "territory" of Palestine. It is, perhaps,