

Arab and Jewish workers in the field of economic endeavor." Hashomer Hat-zair emphasized further that "the Jewish and Arab labor organization would have a common interest in preventing the flood of cheap labor streaming to Palestine from surrounding countries."

This is, indeed, identical with Borochov's position on the issue, probably upon realizing that the native population was contrary to his expectations, not "nomads that can always emigrate east."

In his essay on the history of Poalie-Tzion entitled Letoldot Trn'at Poalie-Tzion, Borochov records that Poalie-Tzion "favours class solidarity between Jewish and Arab workers and sees in the class struggle to improve working conditions a means to strengthen the position of Hebrew labor in Eretz-Yesrael...."<sup>100</sup>

If this is so, then in practice the left- and right-wing Poalie-Tzion did not differ except in their pragmatism. They were implementing essentially the same strategy with only a tactical difference, more pragmatism on the left side. Both were promoting the position of Hebrew labor (ostensibly in the name of proletarian solidarity between Arabs and Jews) by means of common organization or separate labor unions. "Solidarity with Arab labor to strengthen the position of Hebrew labor in Eretz Yesrael," as stated explicitly by Borochov, means necessarily strengthening the Jewish position in the labor market at Arab expense. This involved improving the conditions of native Arab labor in order that it ceases to be a threatening competitor for immigrant Jewish labor, the only way to implement a settler-colonial program determined to create a new working class of its own instead of capitalizing on the exploitation of the indigenous labor force.