

national program was superceded by the transfer program is not accidental; proletarian Zionism is intrinsically incapable of implementation in other than the "transfer" way. To elaborate, in the previous chapter we tried to establish that theoretically Borochovism was bourgeois in character. In this chapter, we intended to demonstrate that also in practice Borochovism (the imperative of Jewish proletarianization and Jewish class struggle) was implementable only in terms of capitalist development. Exclusive Jewish proletarianization and class struggle implied necessarily the consolidation of Jewish capitalism.

The reproduction of an exclusive Jewish capitalism transplanted in the midst of a pre-capitalist social formation was simply inconceivable. It contradicted the laws of capitalist accumulation. For the reproduction of Jewish capitalist relations of production required necessarily the integration and subordination of Jewish pre-capitalist forms of production. To guarantee the reproduction of the Jewishness of the relations of production, of social classes, and of class struggle, it was imperative to deform the indigenous social formation. Deformation was executed through dispossession and expulsion of the Palestinians. Proletarian Zionism could have been implemented without "transfer" of the indigenous population only if this population was Jewish. In that case, however, the proletarian strategy loses its relevance to Zionism.

One may further argue that the transfer solution took precedence over bi-nationalism, owing to incongruities between the proletarian Zionist theory and the material and non-material conditions of Palestine in which it was put into practice; and that it could have been implemented differently in a different environment, say if Palestine were, in fact, "a coun-