

The framework adopted by Castles and Kosack for five major European recipients of migrant workers is quite relevant here (Castles and Kosack, 1973:6-8). Their conclusions may be summarised in the following points: (1) There, as well as in Israel, immigrant labour has become structurally necessary for the economy of the host (capitalist) country; undesirable jobs deserted by indigenous labour are filled by "guest" workers who are increasingly becoming a subordinate section of the original working class. (2) Division of labour in production (between skilled and unskilled labour) is duplicated in the social sphere, where a split in the class consciousness of the indigenous workers occurs, blurring their solidarity with migrant workers. (3) The presence of migrant labour allows for actual (occupational) and subjective (status) mobility of the dominant section of the working class. A political consequence of this process is the negation of a dichotomous view of class conflict, to one that favours self-conception in terms of individual mobility.

The ethnic heterogeneity of Israeli Jewish society, reinforced by successive waves of migration from diverse cultural backgrounds, has always been a determinant factor in shaping the class structure of Israel. The weak development of class consciousness among Jews should thus be attributed primarily to this ethnic diversity, rather than to Arab-Jewish labour relationships (cf. Machover and Orr, 1972:91-93). In this respect, the hypothesis suggested above by Castles and Kosack concerning the "class blurring" impact of nationally diverse migrant workers should be modified in the Israeli case. Moreover, trade union consciousness (as opposed to class consciousness) is particularly strong, and purely economic demands made by Jewish workers seem to be extended to protect the interests of those Israeli Arab workers who are solidly organised and have stable employment. This situation obviously applies only to a section of the