

any other people.¹²⁹

Official opinions in Israel have expressed serious concern over the use of Arab hired labor, as they see in it a violation of Labor-Zionism, according to which Zionist colonization in Palestine was meant to "replace" not to "exploit" indigenous labor. For example, Itzhak Ben-Aharon, the powerful Secretary General of the Histadrut Labor Federation, stated in an interview with the New York Times that "...six years of occupation had eroded Israel's image of 'moral capacity and reliability' in the Western world." He charged that "Israel was 'building Zionism' on the backs of hired Arab labor from the occupied territories" -- a reference to the 55,000 Arab workers who have become the core of the manual labor force in Israel since the 1967 war.¹³⁰ Contrasted with these "Dovish" voices mourning the death of labor ideals are the "Hawkish" voices in the Labor Party asserting the rationale for replacing these outlived ideals.

The dominance of the economic is finally asserted over the political and ideological. A recent article in Davar, the organ of the ruling Israeli Labor Party, explicitly states:

"Workers from the occupied territories have many advantages over Israeli workers. Israeli workers shun industry and production, whereas workers from the territories are becoming concentrated more and more in industry. It is almost impossible to fire an Israeli worker or to relocate him without his permission and without a wage increase. On the other hand, an Arab worker is exceptionally mobile, can be dismissed without notice and moved from place to place, does not strike and does not present demands....From many economic considerations, workers from the territories are a bargain for the Israeli economy. They exist when and where required and make a full contribution to the production cycle. As long as we don't speak in social or political terms, the workers from the territories display an excellent economic flexibility." 131