

Jewish capitalist tends to lay-off Jewish workers and replace them with Gentiles, a tendency which Borochov condemns as "Jewish anti-Semitism" of the assimilationist Jewish bourgeoisie. In his words:

"...The Jewish manufacturer who is about to become a big capitalist wants to sever, as soon as possible, his relations with the Jewish community from which he emerged. He does it for two reasons. He wants to conquer the Gentile market and be on the same footing with the Gentile manufacturer. His Jewishness is in this respect a disadvantage, since his competitors refuse to recognize him as equal. He is, therefore, eager to display his goyish (non-Jewish) patriotism...He is anxious to employ Gentile workers and managers, to as great an extent as possible, restrict his commercial intercourse to Gentiles because he wants to identify himself with his Gentile competitor and rid himself of Jewish public control.... The Jewish employer, upon introducing steam power into his factory (the symbol of large-scale production), substitutes the Gentile for the Jewish worker." 91

In these words, Borochov is emphasizing the impossibility of the development of Jewish capitalist/proletariat class relations in Diaspora; and therefore of political class struggle in Jewish life of the Galut, Jewish class struggle remains "economic class struggle". He is not, however, denying Jewish proletarianization by Gentile capital. As a matter of fact, Borochov cannot deny the latter, as he explicitly asserts that his Zionism expresses the objective movement and interests of an already existing Jewish working class, and not that of a potential one, and it is from this very "starting point" that he claims his is a proletarian Zionism. This assertion, as Bober points out, "occupies such a central position in Borochovist theory that without it the theory loses even its formal claim as proletarian Zionism and becomes ordinary Zionism."<sup>92</sup>

Defending this point, Borochov explicitly states:

"If it were the case that the interests of the Jewish bourgeoisie and of the masses standing on the verge of proletarianization led them to territorialism, while the interests of the Jewish proletariat were not connected with territorialism, then there would be no grounds for saying that the future of the entire Jewish people is also the future of the Jewish prole-