

strategy. This reinterpretation of Borochovism is the subject of the following chapter. We outline it here only to point out the methodological rationale. Underlying our choice of the Borochovist Labor-Zionist formulation are the following:

(1) We wish to argue that Labor-Zionism is essentially bourgeois and implementable only on capitalist development lines, and it is our research strategy, therefore, to show that Borochovism, the very extreme left, which in fact incorporates dialectical materialist methods, is itself bourgeois in character.

(2) This way, we try to expose the apparent and misleading logical contradiction that the proletarianization of Palestinians in Israel against the historically ideological commitment for exclusive Jewish proletarianization presents to the Israeli public and other observers of this process. We try to expose it as an objective contradiction emerging precisely from the implementation of Borochovism. That is, treating from a dialectical materialist perspective the classical development planning question: the question of disparities between planning objectives and consequences. In planning theory, this question is treated mechanically, in terms either of logical contradiction (inconsistency in the theory and/or plan), or of implementation error. At best, explanations are sought in incongruities between the theory and the environmental world in which the theory was practiced.<sup>42</sup> The possibility of objective contradiction emerging from the unity of materially opposing tendencies suggested by the dialectical materialist method is not subject of consideration.

Our analysis of Borochovism focuses precisely on identifying the materially contradictory tendencies, the unity of which it objectively