

embodies. The objective materially contradictory tendencies inherent in socialist Zionism (Borochovism) lie in its simultaneously capitalist and sectarian character, that it embodies capitalist relations of production which are also exclusively Jewish. This is quite different from the radical critique of Borochovism, which points out inconsistencies between theory and reality and, at best, the logical contradiction and objective infeasibility of the essential unity of Zionism and socialism, which it is claimed to embody.⁴³ We argue that the underlined, however, are not the materially contradictory tendencies objectively embodied in socialist Zionism; no socialist element or tendency is embodied in "socialist" Zionism. Socialist Zionism is objectively bourgeois.

This is to indicate the methodological value for development theory that can be derived from the analysis of Borochovism in this study: this is applying the dialectical materialist method to a case study of a development plan (or theory of action) which, itself, incorporates the dialectical materialist method.

(3) Furthermore, this is also an exercise in class-analysis of the content of development plans/theories independently of the planner's intention.

(4) Borochovism is an appropriate case for illustrating the rotation and unity of the economic, the political, and the ideological in the development process, or, using Engel's words, that:

"...political, religious, philosophical, etc., development is based on economic development. But all these interact upon one another and also upon the economic bases. It is not that the economic situation is cause solely active, while everything else is only passive effect, there is rather interaction on the basis of economic necessity, which ultimately always asserts itself," 44