

in the transcendence of the dominant mode of accumulation, as the case is for the emancipation of humanity at large. The Borochovist conception of the Jewish question leads to the conclusion that the only solution to the Jewish question lies in re-establishing the bond with land from which Jews have been liberated, through class struggle, much earlier than other people; advancing the essentially social nature of the problem and its fundamental solution; a point in the transformation of humanity's problem, expected to be reached through capitalism as its ultimately progressive contribution to history.

For Borochov, however, the only remedy was Zionism, as a territorialist solution to the national and class questions of landless people; that is, settler-colonialism "through class struggle". "Socialism," he says, "is our goal but Zionism is our immediate need....Class struggle is the road to both."

Negated in his interpretation of the peculiarities of Jewish society, class struggle becomes central to his strategy for changing those peculiarities, as demonstrated in the last section. In the following section, however, we try to demonstrate the petty bourgeois, non-proletarian class origin of socialist-Zionism.

B. The Class Interest to Which Borochovism Corresponds:

Having sketched the decline of East European Jewry from the nineteenth century onwards, as we noted in the previous section, Abram Leon "explains the development of the Zionist utopia as an ideological reflection on the problems of the declassed Jewish petty bourgeoisie, supplanted in the economy by the rising indigenous middle class and deprived of all prospects in the framework of decadent capitalism."⁵⁶ We argue that nothing in the Borochovist theory of socialist Zionism disproves Leon's identification of the petty bourgeois class origin of Zionism in general. This is to say, in other words,