

conditions under which Zionism becomes a mobilizing material force capable of creating new material conditions, the transplantation of Israel in Palestine.

We argue, however, that only one postulate of Zionism that proved to become a mobilizing material force, namely Labor-Zionism, became so only in the Borochovist formulation. (Recall from the previous chapter our methodological rationale for selecting Borochovism out of all other postulates of Zionism.)

It is our purpose in this chapter to identify the reasons that made Borochovism a mobilizing material force: the material conditions from which it rose, the materialist approach it embodied and the material conditions it was formulated to create. In this kind of analysis we intend to illustrate and highlight the interaction between objective forces (material conditions) and subjective forces (theory, ideology) in the development of Borochovism and, accordingly, Israel.

Before entering the analysis of Borochovism itself, let us make a few points:

(a) That Zionism in all its postulates is essentially political. The distinction between spiritual/religious Zionism versus political Zionism is a false distinction. From its inception, the Zionist idea was the idea of a Jewish State. This point is best documented by Maxime Rodinson, Israel: A Colonial Settler State? The distinction between political and religious Zionism is a tactical and pragmatic one, regarding what appeals more to the Jewish masses who were to be mobilized for actualizing the idea.

(b) That Zionism in all its postulates is essentially bourgeois con-