position on the Histadrut emphasizing what he calls "the original egalitarian qualities of the Histadrut". These traits according to him were altered under Israel due to an outside force, namely "bureaucratization". Eisenstadt, The Transformation of Israeli Society (London; Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985) pp. 132-135.

- 45) "Simpson's Report", op cit. pp. 123-124. see also Tamar, Gozansky. hitpathut.., op cit. p. 108.
- 46) In late 1920, the Histadrut claimed to represent 27,000 Jewish workers with their families. By late 1940s, its membership rose to 140,000. See "Simpson's Report", op cit., p. 126.: Survey of Palestine, 1945-46, Chapt. XV11, p. 757.

Nonetheless, the Histadrut did exclude various groups from its membership. Thus, in addition to the exclusion of Arab workers, the Histadrut rejected membership of Jewish workers affiliated with the Communist Party, the Tehiya religious movement and the Yemenite Arab Jews. See Survey of Palestine, 1945-46 p. 757.

- 47) "Simpson's Report", p. 121.
- 48) Ibid., pp. 121-122.
- 49) See "Extracts from notes of an interview granted by the Chief Secretary on the 19th of December, 1931 to a deputation from the Jewish farmers' Federation", dated, 21/12/1931, in CO 733/250/1, enclosure VI, File, 72041.
- 50) Ibid.,
- 51) Thus, for example, on Nov. 21, it was reported that:

Arab packers at the grove of Mr. Levy and Mr. David Eber at Bnei Brak settlement were obstructed and prevented by picketters of the Federation of Labour from carrying out their work. Similar incidents were reported in many other settlements.