

as far as it affects, in the last instance, the political the demographic requirements for a Jewish bourgeois democratic state.

Evaluating the effects of this protective role of the Histadrut, the same authors write:

"In the main, except for seasonal employment in the citrus groves and a few enterprises based on government concessions, the policy of exclusive employment of Jewish workers has prevailed. It has no doubt increased the absorption capacity of Jews in Palestine, in the short run, but it has also been a very important factor in maintaining the barrier between the Arab and Jewish peoples. Jewish labor proposes to continue to maintain this barrier at least until the Arab sectors of the economy have developed to the point where Arabs work approximately for the same wage as Jews." 82

These apartheid-like implications of the practices of Labor-Zionist institutions, specifically the Histadrut, were facts created and used to justify the contradictory political positions of left wing Zionists regarding the native Palestinian labor. As Yaacov Roi, an Israeli historian, documents, when challenged by the Arab labor movement leading to the 1929 and 1936-39 Palestinian mass revolts,

"They preached that the international brotherhood of workers applied only to workers who were already secure in their employment; it did not apply to a potential proletariat that had to struggle to find employment and could not refrain from conflict with those workers whose place of work they must take for themselves." 83

Implicit in this statement is the conviction that proletariat refers only to an already organized labor force, applying therefore to Jewish labor only. Unorganized labor constitutes only potential proletariat, threatening by the cheapness of its labor power to displace the "indigenous" actual Jewish proletariat, and hence, deserves no solidarity on the part of the latter.

In accordance with this left-wing Zionist position, unorganized labor