proletarian and bourgeois ideologies. This, indeed, culminates most accurately in Borochov's assertion of the "organic unity of socialism and Zionism" as the essence of his doctrine; the attempt to unite the two fundamentally opposite aspirations: proletarian internationalism (socialism) and sectarian bourgeois nation-statism (Zionism).

Moreover, "even when the petty-bourgeois sectors adopt working-class positions," says Poulantzas, "they often do so by investing them with their own ideological practices." This explains, on the level of political articulation, why left-wing socialist-Zionist political parties, specifically Hashomer Hatsair prior to Statehood, and MAPAM in Israel, have sometimes adopted a working-class position to invest in their own ideological practices; especially for the purpose of promoting aliyah, hence the realization of Zionism. This is to say that the conjunctural adoption of proletariat positions by political formations of Borochovism (left-Zionist parties) may not imply that these formations essentially articulate the class interest of the proletariat; this is even more true when such positions were taken inconsistently as the case with left-Zionist parties.

Poulantzas indicates further

"...that certain ideological elements specific to the petty bourgeoisie may themselves have their effects on the working class' ideology, and because of the particular class determination of the petty bourgeoisie. This happens in a manner different to that in which bourgeois ideology acts, This is even the main danger that permanently threatens the working-class. It may take the form of convergence and a malformation of these elements with working-class ideology, particularly the form of petty-bourgeois socialism, but also...the forms of anarcho-syndicalism and revolutionary syndicalism, which can all affect the working-class." 61

Such petty bourgeois socialism and anarcho-syndicalism can be said, in the case of socialist-Zionism, to be configurated in the forms of the collective