

this compatibility of the strategy with the tactics and the material condition that made the Borochovist blend of the Zionist ideology appeal to the masses and, therefore, become a material force, the basis for Jewish settlement later on, and the hegemonic ideology during the Yishuv phase and thereafter.

Moreover, the attempt to maintain two separate economies in Palestine during the Yishuv, with a closed modern Jewish economy in the midst of the indigenous, is often interpreted as an attempt to establish economic dualism; a dual economy as a material base for bi-nationalism. This interpretation is inaccurate, as the development pattern which actually took place, an essentially capitalist economy transplanted into the heart of an underdeveloped one, meant, in fact, the "replacement" of, not co-existence with, the indigenous social formation. Simply put, there can be no overlapping social formations in the same place and time (as, for example, the overlapping of patterns of relations of production, of modes within a social formation). When and where Labor-Zionism was implemented it necessarily meant, in effect, the uprooting or distorting of the indigenous social formation. That is why we tend to assert that socialist bi-nationalism advocated then by left-wing Zionism, specifically Hashomer Hatzair, was an empty slogan. This does not necessarily imply hypocrisy or insincerity on the part of its advocates, but perhaps failure to identify the material prerequisites for such a solution and some ignorance of the actual effects inflicted by the historical practices of socialist Zionism on the social being of the Palestinian people. For Jewish settlers to strike roots in Palestine (possible only by creating a social formation, or a reproduction site) under capitalist relations, it was eventually imperative to uproot