Do Thais Eat Dogs? Thai Migrant Workers in Israel and the Dog Meat Eating Myth

Nir Avieli*
Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Israelis accuse Thai migrant workers, who make for the bulk of the workforce of Israeli agriculture, for eating the flesh of Israeli pet dogs. However, eating dog meat is unacceptable in Thailand, while the accusations of eating dog meat in Israel have no material support. Why then are Israelis so adamant that the Thai migrant workers systematically hunt and eat their dogs. In this article, based on ethnographic research conducted in Israel's rural periphery and on critical media analysis, I argue that the dog eating myth has very little to do with the Thai culinary preferences in Thailand or Israel, and was actually formulated by the Israelis so as to relegate the Thais, members of the new global class of cheap laborers, into a specific social position in the Israeli power-structure so as to justify their economic exploitation. Thus, dog meat was singled out as the basis for this derogatory myth because of the meaning and social positions attributed by Israelis to dogs.

Keywords: *Thai migrant workers; dog meat; Israel; food stereotypes*

It is a well-established Israeli *total social fact* (Mauss, 2002 [1954]) that Thai migrant workers systematically hunt and eat Israeli pet dogs. Canine flesh, however, is rarely eaten in Thailand, while my pursuit of reported cases of dog-meat eating by Thai migrant workers in Israel repeatedly led to the conclusion that the specific events I was following did not actually involve dog eating. My follow up of media reports on dog-meat consumption by Thai migrant workers led to similar ends: despite the bold headlines and condemning readers' comments, the reports accusing Thai migrant workers for hunting and eating dogs regularly turned into blurry texts in which the question whether dog-meat was practically eaten by Thai migrant workers remained unclear. Why is it, then, that Israelis are so adamant that Thai migrant workers eat the flesh of their pet dogs? In this article I argue that the dog eating myth was created by Israelis so as to relegate the Thais, members of the new global

* Dept of Sociology and Anthropology, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel. Avieli@bgu.ac.il

class of cheap laborers, into a specific social position in the Israeli power-structure that justifies their economic exploitation.

Some of the data presented was collected during the late 1990's within a study on the working conditions of migrant workers in Israel. Further ethnographic data was collected over the years in different contexts and occasions. While the early data may seem outdated, I argue that in a specific moment in time, as a consequence of the arrival of significant numbers of migrant workers to Israel in the mid 1990's, Israelis had to deal with these newcomers and with the social and cultural dilemmas they posed for a nation that was still upholding, at least rhetorically, socialist and egalitarian ethos, and was still venerating self-sufficiency, work and agriculture as Zionist ideals. Once accusations of dog-meat eating were established as a "total social fact" in the late 90's, these dilemmas were solved, at least to a certain extent, and only called for occasional "maintenance".

THAI MIGRANT WORKERS IN ISRAEL

Thai migrant workers first arrived in Israel in the late 80` so as one of the main reasons to replace the Palestinians, who made for the bulk of the cheap manpower of the Israeli economy since the 1967 occupation (Bartram, 1998; Cohen, 1999; Kurlander, 2022). Palestinian suicide attacks by organizations opposing the Oslo Accords led Rabin's Government to impose closures on the occupied territories, which resulted in manpower shortage that had negative impact on the Israeli economy and specifically on agriculture, construction, and caregiving. Amounting employers' pressures and the failure to attract Israeli Jews to these jobs (Rosenhek, 2000) led to the government's decision to import increasing numbers of migrant workers.

The Ministry of Interior officials charged with handling the import of migrant workforce decided that workers from specific countries would be allocated to specific economic segments. Cohen (1999) argues that the Thais were allotted to agriculture because of their assumed background as farmers and because they came from a tropical country and were expected to better cope with the heat. The actual numbers of Thai migrant workers in the country is not clear. In the time of my study, according to an Israeli Parliament 2014 report[1] there were 22,500 agricultural migrant workers in the country, presumably all from Thailand, while according to the Immigration Authority[2], in late 2015 there were some 22,000 Thais legally employed in agriculture, and some 650 illegal employees[3].

At this time according to the 2015 edition of the "Foreign Workers' Rights Handbook", published by the Israeli Immigration Authority[4], Thai migrant workers get a one-year working visa that can be extended for up to sixty-three months. This official publication states (ibid. footnote 7) that migrant workers in Israel were entitled in 2015 to the national minimum wage of 4300 ILS (roughly 1200 US$)

for 186 working hours per month. Like all employees in Israel, they were entitled to extra payment for overtime, health insurance, social security, and other social benefits[5].

As migrant workers they were entitled to "suitable housing", defined as "at least 4 square meters sleeping space per worker, no more than 6 workers in one room, personal cupboards and bedding for each worker, heating and ventilation, reasonable lighting and electric outlets in each room, hot and cold water in the bathroom, kitchen and showers; sinks, kitchen counters and cupboards, burners, refrigerator, table and chairs, a washing machine for 6 workers[6]. There must be reasonable access to the living quarters as well as to bathrooms" (ibid pp. 10). I quote the entire paragraph because it reflects a grim reality that calls for some elaboration.

First, the instructions are so detailed precisely because, as we have seen while conducting our study in the late 1990s and in the years that followed[7], quite a few Israeli employers did not provide even these essentials and had to be forced to make them available. Along the years, Israeli and international media repeatedly reported of cases where the employers subjected Thai workers to abysmal living conditions[8]. Second, these rules define very basic living conditions, with up to six adults sharing a 24 square meters room. This means that a two-bedroom mobile home of some 48 square meters, intended for two adults, perhaps with a child or two, can legally house twelve (!) adult Thai workers. Thus, even when employers did follow the rules, these only made for very basic if not miserable living conditions: large numbers of men crowded into dilapidating mobile homes and farming structures such as sheds and chicken coups converted into low quality, badly maintained dwellings, unsafe electricity and improvised showers and toilets. Many of the "kitchens" and dining areas are actually a few tables and chairs, a fridge, a stove, and a sink in the yard next to these dwellings.

The third reason for quoting the housing regulations has to do with the fact that according to the official handbook, Israeli employers are entitled to deduct up to 25% of their workers' salaries for "housing and related expenses" (ibid. pp 12). While the regulations clearly stress that "this is not an automatic deduction and the employer may only deduct actual expenses" (ibid. pp. 13), and while the 2015 handbook quotes a maximum deduction of some 500 ILS, which make for some 12% of the minimum wage, during the research period we were asked by many of the Thai workers why 25% of their salary was knocked off. When we asked the employers, they referred us to their accountants, who quoted the rule above. In most cases, flat 25% were simply withdrawn with no reference to the employers' actual expenses. Thus, in some cases, twelve Thai men, that were housed in a cramped and poorly maintained mobile home, were practically charged over 13,000 shekels (some 3700US$) for "rent and related expenses" per month. This was five to ten times the market price for renting mobile homes (though the maintenance level of migrant-workers' dwellings was often so low that no one would have rented them). In fact, for 3700$ they could probably rent a well maintained six bedrooms villa.

Another disturbing economic issue was the loan that most Thai workers had to take to cover their initial airfare and paperwork, processed by Thai and Israeli manpower agencies. Our interviewees reported sums of 5000-10000 US$ in the late 1990's[9], usually obtained from Thai loan sharks that incurred a yearly interest of 50-100%. These money lenders were reputedly connected to Thai criminal organizations and the Thai migrant workers were terrified from the prospect of being unable to return their loans, fearing that the lenders would harm their families.

The Thai migrant workers were practically enslaved by these loans, which took anything between two and three years to cover, but only if they worked a substantial number of extra hours. In fact, most Thai workers reported working twelve hours a day seven days a week, at least until they repaid their loan within roughly two years. The employers, many of whom knew about these debts, told us that their Thai employees insisted on working so many hours. One of them explained that if he wouldn't allow his Thai employees to work unlimited extra hours, they would leave. Many Thai workers worked as much as 370 hours per month, roughly twice the number of hours stipulated by the law. As far as it is known, collection of recruitment fees has been stopped after the implementation of the bilateral agreement between Israel and Thailand (Kushnirovich and Raijman, 2019; Kurlander and Cohen, 2022).

According to the 2015 Human Rights Watch report, titled "A Raw Deal: Abuse of Thai Workers in Israel's Agricultural Sector"[10], Thai migrant workers "were paid salaries significantly below the legal minimum wage, forced to work long hours in excess of the legal maximum, subjected to unsafe working conditions, and denied their right to change employers... Thai workers were housed in makeshift and inadequate accommodations. Only workers in one of the ten groups Human Rights Watch interviewed were able to show us salary slips, and these were written in Hebrew, and did not accurately reflect the hours that workers had worked". Cohen and Kurlander (2023: 239) go even further and describe their employment with the terms "Trafficking in Persons, Modern Slavery and Forced Labor". Let me explain why I elaborate on the abusive employment conditions of the Thai migrant workers: I argue that the dog eating myth is intended to dehumanize them so as to justify their exploitation.

THAI MIGRANT WORKERS AND ISRAELI PETS

In 1995, as increasing numbers of migrant workers arrived in Israel, Erik Cohen and Zeev Rosnhek from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem initiated the first study on migrant workers in Israel (Cohen 1999). Prof. Cohen was my PhD advisor and recruited me as a research assistant. While conducting our study, the Israeli-Jewish populace was gripped by a severe attack of moral panic. Multiple media reports accused Thai migrant workers

of stalking protected wild animals and for systematically hunting and eating pet dogs. This wave of accusations culminated with the publication of a double paged story by journalist David Regev in Israel's leading newspaper *Yediot Ahronot* on June 9, 1996, with extra-large bold headlines announcing: "The Target: Dogs". The different sections of the article were tagged with a small photo of an Asian looking man holding a knife and a text that read: "The Hunters: Special Inquiry".

The bold sub headlines read: "Thai workers are not satisfied with the food provided by their employers and go on hunting trips. As if in a military raid, they operate in small units: dogcatchers, spice gatherers, skin removers, cooks, and guards; They raid groves and neighborhoods, set cruel traps, slaughter man's best friend and feast over its flesh around the barbeque". Another bold sub-headline reads: "Testimony: I saw a Thai turning a huge spit; I was horrified to realize that he was roasting a leg-chopped dog".

The article explained how, as complaints over the vanishing of dogs in areas where Thai migrant workers were employed amassed, the reporter and photographer launched a six month long investigation. According to the journalists, Thai migrant workers ate "modest, meatless meals" during weekdays but on weekends went on hunting sprees, trapped birds, wild animals and domestic pets, and specifically dogs. The text described an orgiastic celebration of killing, dismembering, and roasting of dogs, whose flesh was consumed with large quantities of alcohol.

The text was accompanied by five large blurry photos, each with its own caption. The main photo was that of a head-covered human figure holding what looks like a plastic bag, squatting by a small fire of branches and weeds, with a little arrow pointing at the bag. The text reads: "A recipe for dinner: Thai takes dog out of plastic bag". Next was a picture of a miserably looking dog whose head is trapped in a plastic container attached to a pole. The text reads: "The Trap: chocolate is placed as bait in the plastic container. This stray dog managed to push his head into the container, but couldn't get it out. The dog was released by the photographer, badly injured and infested with parasites". A set of three adjacent photos included: 1. Two Asian looking men walking in a field with the caption "The Lookout"; Two men standing under a laundry rope with cloths hanging over their heads, pulling something out of a bucket, with the heading "The Preparations"; and a picture of an improvised barbeque with some pieces of unclear matter and the text: "The Leftovers: last night the Thais feasted over the barbeque, these are the morning's leftovers".

There were six photos altogether: an Asian-looking man holding a knife; two Asian-looking men walking in a field; two human figures bent over a bucket; a human figure whose head is covered, squatting by the fire and holding a bag; some unrecognizable stuff over an improvised grill; and a dog whose head is trapped in a plastic container. Not one of the humans is clearly Thai, not one of images clearly involves food preparation, and none of the photos that depict cooking clearly involve dog meat, and for that matter, any kind of meat or the practice of cooking. As for the dog, it might have been purposely trapped by Thai migrant workers – but there is no

evidence in the picture that can support this claim. In fact, there is no evidence that the dog was purposely trapped by anyone, let alone by Thai migrant workers. All in all, the photos do not provide evidence that Thai migrant workers were hunting and eating dogs. The bold headlines and text, however, wove a coherent story out of the images, convincing readers that they were observing hard evidence showing Thai migrant workers hunting, butchering, cooking, and eating dogs.

The article attracted significant public attention and media reaction and elicited heated discussions and condemnations on the radio and TV. While most readers didn't notice the article's shortcomings, some professional commentators did point out that there was a problem with this journalistic project. On the day of publication, the reporter and photographer were interviewed on the popular TV program "Evening News", where they were confronted by the host, a senior journalist, who accused them of making claims despite very little supportive evidence in the photos. The reporter responded that they had blunt pictures of the slaughtering and cooking of dogs, but felt that these were too explicit and might hurt the public feelings. The journalists might have been genuine in their wish to spare the public feelings, but the outcome was a misleading text. Nevertheless, this article was seminal in cementing the image of the Thai migrant workers as cruel dog-meat eaters.

While conducting our research during 1995-1997 on the Thai migrant workers, frequent references were made to this article and to dog-meat eating by many of our interviewees and by people with whom I happened to discuss our study. I was intrigued by the fact that farmers which employed Thai workers, as well manpower agents involved in their employment, vehemently rejected these accusations. Other people, who had little or no contact with the Thai workers, passionately argued that Thais do eat dogs, both in Thailand and in Israel. When I asked some members of the latter group whether they personally saw Thais hunting or eating dogs, or whether they have seen dogs eaten in Thailand, the most common response was: "I personally never saw it, but my cousin/friend/neighbor/friend-of-friend did!". It turned out that Israelis who had direct contact with Thai migrant workers denied the accusations of dog meat eating, while Israelis that had no contact with them were adamant that they did. I was facing a "riddle of food and culture" (Harris, 1998): why were Israelis accusing Thai migrant workers of hunting and eating dogs though this was denied by the Thais and by their Israeli employers and was never substantiated by concrete evidence?

In what follows, I will first examine the social position of dogs in Thailand. I will then consider the foodways and eating practices of Thai migrant workers in Israel and specifically their acquisition and handling of meat. I will conclude by discussing the ethical complications involved in the employment of migrant workers in Israel and explain how the dog eating myth helped settling them.

A disclaimer is due here. It might very well be the case that dogs were caught in traps set by Thai migrant workers. It might also be the case that an extremely hungry Thai worker did hunt, cook, and eat a dog. While such events were never

positively confirmed, there is a huge discrepancy between the acknowledgment that such an event might have happened and the common Israeli belief that Thai migrant workers routinely and systematically kill and eat their pet dogs.

THAI DOGS

During the late 1990s, while taking part in the research on Thai migrant workers in Israel, I was employed as a tour guide by an Israeli travel agency, leading tours to East and Southeast Asia. Thailand was almost always included in the itinerary, as a destination or as a springboard to neighboring countries. Conducting research on the Thai migrant workers in Israel and facing the widespread accusations regarding their fondness of dog meat, I begun paying attention to how dogs were treated in Thailand and whether they were eaten or treated as practical or potential food.

It was hard to ignore the miserable state of dogs that I observed in Thai public and semi-public spaces. In urban Thailand, dogs were part of the street scene, lying by the stairs and thresholds of houses in the narrow *sois* (urban alleys), roaming the streets and congregating in *wat* (Buddhist temple) yards. The dogs rarely had collars or other markings of human ownership, were skinny and often had observable injuries, rashes, and skin diseases. They didn't look as if they were groomed as pets or working dogs, nor, for that matter, as food. In fact, they looked extremely unhealthy and unappealing, and I seriously doubt that someone would consider eating, let alone craving their flesh.

When inquiring about their presence in temple yards, I was told that Buddhist temples were safe havens for stray animals. The dogs at these temples were as skinny and miserable as the rest of the dogs visible in urban settings. Their congregation in the temples suggested that they were treated badly and needed protection, but I was assured that though they were neglected and hungry, they were not threatened by hunters or butchers.

In the countryside, dogs were used as guards, kept on leashes, or running around at farmyards, barking loudly at passersby. They looked better fed than urban dogs, had healthier fur, and rarely had observable skin diseases. In Vietnam (and China) I have seen dog merchants, dog-meat restaurants, and dog meat sold at markets (Avieli, 2011). However, I have never seen dog merchants in Thailand. Moreover, having visited dozens of markets in different parts of Thailand, I have never seen dog meat on offer, nor did I see restaurants that served dog meat.

The local tour guides who accompanied my tour groups in Vietnam and China often mentioned dog meat, pointed to dog meat sold at markets, and referred to restaurants that specialize in this kind of meat. This was actually a way of engaging the tourists, provoking their orientalist stereotypes and fears, amusing and horrifying them at once. This, however, was never the case in Thailand. The only exception was the occasional mentioning by Thai tour guides that the *Akha*, one of

Thailand's ethnic groups or "hill-tribes", were dog-eaters (cf. Maneeprasert, 1989). Ethnic minorities, however, are considered by most ethnic Thais to be of low status (Leepreecha, 2005), and the *Akha* are considered among the most "backward" ethnic groups in the country (Trupp, 2015). Thus, when ethnic Thai guides were pointing out that the *Akha* ate dog meat, they were depicting them as exotic and primitive savages, and through this distinction, defined their own ethnic group as civilized, sophisticated, modern and western-oriented. These guides were clearly disgusted by the idea of eating dog meat, and the fact that the low-esteemed *Akha* did crave this flesh made it all the more repulsive.

My claims that Thais do not eat dogs are supported by Stanley Tambiah's (1969) authoritative ethnographic analysis of human-animal relations in *Phraan Muan* village in Northeastern Thailand, where specific attention is paid to dogs and their social status. Tambiah begins by pointing out that the dog is one of the ten animals whose flesh is forbidden in Buddhism, the others being humans, elephants, horses, snakes, lions, tigers, leopards, bears, and hyenas. While some of these creatures are forbidden for their royal status (horse and elephant) or their food preferences (hyenas), Tambiah argues that the dog is forbidden due to its proximity to human beings. While some Buddhist sources put forward that the dog is man's best friend and eating it verges on cannibalism, Tambiah points out that dogs in Theravada Buddhist Thailand are tolerated but loathed. The Thais, he argues, perceive of dogs as humanlike creatures that breach two of the most fundamental human taboos: they are incestuous and they eat their own feces:

> "The dog is in one sense a friend of man, but it is not a "pet" as understood by the English. It is treated casually, given great license and little care. It is, in fact, an animal that arouses paradoxical attitudes which are symptomatic of its close bearing on human relationships. *The dog is not edible*; *this is not simply a neutral attitude but a definite taboo*… This animal, though close to man, is viewed as a "low creature"; it eats feces and is therefore unclean and inedible. The dog is regarded as the incestuous animal par excellence; canine parents and children copulate… the dog is treated as a "degraded human"; its inedibility corresponds to notions of uncleanliness and incest…One of the strongest insults that one villager can hurl at another is to say that a dog has had intercourse with his paternal and maternal ancestors. Other animals do not figure so effectively in insulting language" (*ibid.* 435 my emphasis).

It should be clear from Tambiah's analysis that dogs are disgusting and that eating their flesh would be unthinkable for most Thais. Tambiah's understanding of the taboo on dog-meat in Thailand was very much in line with the attitude of Thai tour guides and other Thais with whom I discussed dog-meat eating: they found it repulsive.

Thai and International newspapers do report on dog-meat trade in Thailand, and specifically in *Issan* (Northeast Thailand), from where most Thai migrant workers in Israel originate (and see the next section). These reports describe a lucrative export of dog-meat to Vietnam (and, to a lesser extent, to southern China), but do not report

that dogs' flesh is consumed by Thais and/or in Thailand. Kate Hodal reports in *The Guardian*: "Every year, hundreds of thousands of pets are snatched in Thailand, then smuggled into Vietnam"[11]. Peter Shadbolt, reporting for CNN, similarly describes how "...as many as 200,000 live dogs every year are smuggled from northeast Thailand across the Mekong River destined for restaurants in Vietnam"[12]. When it comes to the actual consumption of dog meat in Thailand, this is usually attributed to Vietnamese immigrants. *New York Times* correspondent Jonathan Fuller explains: "Eating dog, *by no means a mainstream tradition in Thai cuisine*, is confined to isolated pockets of aficionados, mostly in northeastern Thailand. The practice has existed for decades, chiefly among communities of ethnic Vietnamese"[13].

Thus, even though there is ample evidence for trade in dog-meat in (Northeast) Thailand, they are not butchered in Thailand and the meat is not consumed locally. The relatively few media reports of dog-meat eating in Thailand usually involve ethnic Vietnamese, who are also involved in exporting dog-meat to Vietnam. These reports further support my argument that dog meat is practically tabooed in Thailand, rarely eaten by ethnic Thais if at all, and can be hardly described as part of the Thai foodscape. Thais shun dog-meat and find it revolting. Thus, the assumption made by many Israelis that the Thai migrant workers were simply maintaining their original food habits by eating dog-meat in Israel, has very little to do with Thai actual eating practices.

THE FOODWAYS OF THAI MIGRANT WORKERS IN ISRAEL

Most of the Thai migrant workers in Israel come from *Issan* in Northeast Thailand,[14] a distinguished cultural region that has more in common with Lao culture than with the rest of Thailand. Indeed, the Thai migrant workers we interviewed were visibly pleased when we asked them whether they were Lao, and tended to respond that they were "Lao" or "Lao-Thai".

The distinct *Issan* cuisine is defined, first and foremost, by the use of *khao niew*: "sticky" or glutinous rice rather than the long-grain rice common in other parts of Thailand. While rice, sticky or long-grained, is the centerpiece of Thai meals, as the main source of calories and nutrients, its culinary role is that of a white canvas over which the meal is drawn. Since *Issan* cuisine evolved in a poor region where farming is limited to roughly six months per year, it uses ingredients that are rarely used in other parts of Thailand, and this is especially true for animal products. *Issan* cuisine makes use of the flesh, blood, and internal organs of a large variety of wild and domesticated mammals, birds, reptiles, insects and aquatic creatures. Erik Cohen, who spent many years conducting ethnographic research in Thailand, witnessed how during the dry season subsistence farmers in *Issan* turn to a "hunting and gathering mode". They hunt, set traps in the jungle and in fallow farmlands, fish and trap aquatic animals in natural and manmade waterways, look for edible

insects, and gather domesticated and wild plants' leaves, roots, seeds, nuts, shoots, buds and fruits.

When Thai migrant workers first arrived in Israel, most of the essential *Issan* ingredients and spices were not available. Many of the workers planted gardens next to their dwellings and produced their own chilies, basil, coriander, garlic, onion, spring onion, and at times peppers, tomatoes, and eggplants. These kitchen gardens are a characteristic element of migrant residences to this day and can be found wherever Thai workers reside throughout the country (Shvarzberg, 2023).

Thai migrant workers often had unlimited access to the fruits and vegetables produced by their employers. Israeli agroindustry, however, is often monocrop based, so these Thai workers could have as many cucumbers as they liked in one region, or as many peppers or apricots in other areas, but nothing else. Thus, in most cases, they had to purchase at least some fruits and vegetables. While some of the spices and vegetables mentioned so far are considered exotic and rare in Israel, meat was clearly the most controversial food item on the Thai migrant workers' menu. In the next section I address this issue in some detail.

Meat

Meat is associated with physical and social qualities such as strength, potency, masculinity, wealth and power (Avieli, 2018) while vegetal foods do not share the same semiotic meanings (Oliver, 2023). Indeed, food taboos are almost exclusively focused on the flesh of animals (Fessler and Navarrete, 2003; Fiddes, 2004). This is especially true for the Jewish *kashrut* system, which is meat-centered and is extremely important in Israeli private and public spheres. In his book on the social meanings of meat, Fiddes (2004: 2) argues that meat is "a natural symbol", that is, "a natural metaphor for the social experience". It is of little wonder, then, that the kinds of meat consumed by the Thai workers, a non-Jewish and apparently exotic and "primitive" group of newcomers, attracted more attention and critique than any other food item they ate.

While Thais eat relatively small amounts of animal protein, many of their dishes include some animal flesh, which significantly contributes to their taste. Thai migrant workers in Israel, despite their limited income and the heavy economic burden they carry (and see Kurlander, Shoham and Kaminer in this volume), were still eager to add animal protein to their diet. They devised several strategies for the acquisition of meat: farming poultry, purchasing meat, accepting meat leftovers, stealing and hunting.

Farming Poultry

Many of the Thai dwellings I visited had improvised coops where chicken were raised for eggs and flesh. This was rarely mentioned by their employers, as it was in line with farming activities, even though poultry farming without veterinary inspection or slaughtering is illegal in Israel. Employers and other commenters

did mention, however, that Thai workers farmed fighting cocks. Illegal but widely practiced in Thailand, this activity was also criticized by Israelis for being "cruel." Nevertheless, Israeli employers generally tolerated chicken farming (and cockfighting), as it enhanced the Thai workers' limited culinary and leisure options at no direct cost to the farmers. As we shall see, slaughtering animals for their meat and engaging in cockfights actually contributed to the negative image of the Thai workers as savages.

Purchasing Meat

This was probably the most obvious mode of acquiring meat among Thai migrant workers in Israel, but not necessarily the most convenient. First, meat is expensive, and certainly more expensive than most vegetal food products. Bearing in mind their limited incomes and high debts, Thai workers couldn't afford a lot of meat. Second, shopping for food, and especially for meat, required transportation, which was a significant obstacle in rural areas. The Israeli periphery is badly served by public transport, and Thai migrant workers rarely own cars. Thus, they could shop for food only when their employers provided transportation. While I occasionally met Thai migrant workers at fresh-produce markets, which tend to attract significant numbers of migrant workers of other nationalities, only rarely did I have such encounters at supermarkets. Some employers reported taking their workers to shop at fresh-produce markets on a regular basis. These farmers, however, were the exception that proves the rule: shopping for meat was expensive and practically inaccessible to most Thai workers.

In the late 1990's we were told by employers and workers that an Israeli entrepreneur, who had discovered this captive audience, was driving around in a van stocked with Thai products such as sticky rice and fish sauce, as well as different kinds of meat, which he sold for a hefty profit. Interestingly, he had pork on offer. Pork was quite hard to find in Israel at the time, and for the Thais it was probably the only source of pork. As far as I know, this entrepreneur is not active anymore, probably because Thai products (and pork) have become more accessible.

Leftover Meat

Thai migrant workers were employed in all segments of Israeli agriculture, inclusive of farms that produced milk and dairy products, eggs, meat and fish. Some larger employers (especially *kibbutzim*) were farming vegetables and fruits as well as different kinds of husbandry. Thais employed in these settings often had access to free and practically unlimited amounts of meat. This, however, turned out to be a double-edged sword when it came to their public image as those who "eat everything".

We were told by quite a few poultry farmers that they let their Thai employees help themselves to invalid, sick, dying, or dead birds, which could not be marketed. I have often seen in my village Thai workers slaughtering and cleaning such birds

for their own consumption. However, the very same employers who allowed and at times encouraged this practice (we were once told: "a satiated Thai is a satisfied Thai"), were often visibly repulsed and verbally disgusted by the idea of eating such ailing or dying creatures.

At first, I found this attitude bizarre. After all, these farmers were farming hundreds of thousands of creatures harnessed to a cruel and exploitative agroindustry and destined to violent death at the slaughterhouse. I gradually learned, however, that animal-farmers tended to distance themselves from the act of killing, which was done elsewhere and by other people, and described themselves as life-givers rather than life-takers. This was in line with Carol Adam's (1990, 1998) arguments that moderns distance themselves physically and emotionally from the killing of the animals they eat and actively hide the relations between the meat they eat and the living creatures killed so as to produce it. By killing chicken hands on, often in sight of their employers, the Thai workers demolished the symbolic barriers that protected their employers from facing the violent death they were inflicting on the millions of animals they farmed. The employers' disgusted reaction reestablished the barriers between culture and nature, relegating their Thai employees to the other side of the wall, marking them as cruel and savage.

Stealing

While some Thai migrant workers did have access to free animal flesh, most of them did not. Considering their limited salary and the economic pressures they faced, it is of little wonder that some of them might have resorted to stealing animals for their flesh. An important reservation is due here: while conducting our study, we did hear rumors about Thai workers stealing and eating animal, and several events were reported in the media. However, just like with dog meat, these rumors and reports were usually vague, with the texts often questioning and even contradicting the bold headlines. While I can't positively argue that Thai migrant workers in Israel never stole animals for food, there is little evidence to indicate that they ever did.

Thus, for example, under the headline: "Youth admits to robbing Thais who cooked his duck", a news report from 2012[15] recounts how a 16 years old boy from a southern *moshav* broke into an apartment where Thai migrant workers lived and stole some 600 ILS (160 US$). When questioned by the police, he claimed it was an act of revenge against the Thais because they had stolen and eaten his pet duck a few days earlier. Just like with the other media reports, there was a gap between the headlines and the text itself. No evidence was provided to substantiate the claim that the Thais actually stole or ate the duck. In fact, according to the report, "the Thai workers were interrogated for stealing pets and released". This could have been, and probably was, just an excuse made up by the youth. The point is that the bold headlines create the context and mindset for the readers, most of whom would not make the effort to consider the discrepancy between the headlines and the text. Similar reports have been appearing in the media every few months since the mid 1990's, reminding

Israeli readers that the Thai workers have strange and cruel food habits that Israelis should find repulsive: they steal pets, kill them and consume their flesh.

Hunting

Farmers in *Issan* regularly hunt, trap, and fish to supplement their meat supply (Somnasang et al., 1998; Setalaphruk and Price, 2007). Early in the research period we realized that the migrant workers from *Issan* maintained their foodways as much as they could in Israel: they had rice as staple and cooked their food according to Thai/*Issan* recipes, using Thai spices, herbs, and condiments that they farmed or purchased. They also turned to what for them was an integral part of rural life – hunting small game.

In fact, it was hunting and not dog meat that first attracted the attention of Israeli media to Thai migrant workers' foodways. Israeli Jews rarely hunt, and hunting is usually viewed negatively. Diaspora Jews rarely hunted, probably because game could not be slaughtered according to halachic laws and was therefore not kosher. Moreover, the violent nature of hunting and the meat lust it underlies contradicted the norms and religious propensities of diaspora Jews. When it comes to modern Israel, hunting is rejected due to the Zionist and modernist agendas that emphasized the revival of the land, its fauna and flora. Indeed, up until the arrival of the Thai migrant workers, hunting in Israel was ascribed mainly to Bedouin and Druze: Palestinian subgroups that Israeli Jews generally associate with the idea of the noble savage: brave and ruthless, whose hunting practices only support such perceptions.

It is of little wonder, then, that the Thai workers hunting practices enticed negative media and public response. However, just like with the other meat obtaining strategies described so far, I quickly realized that the media reports were problematic, while employers and other relevant agencies were ambivalent when it came to the hunting practices of the Thai migrant workers. In fact in some cases they were supportive and even enthusiastic.

In a visit to a modern-orthodox kibbutz, the "Thai Coordinator" recounted how he dealt with the large number of wild rabbits that pestered the kibbutz lettuce fields: "We brought all of our Thais, as well as those of two neighboring kibbutzim, and in a few hours they cleaned the fields out. They walked in a line holding bags and were so quick...none of the rabbits got away". He said that he didn't ask the Thais what they did with the rabbits that they seized, but it was obvious that they were eaten.

Another employer reported how once a week, his Thai employees, as well as those employed by his neighbors, would gather by his cowshed and use slingshots to shoot down pigeons that fed over the grains supplied to the cows. He pointed out the Thais were "slingshot masters" and added that this organized hunting helped him lower his expenses by preventing the pigeons from embezzling the cows' feed.

By contrast, I came across an action taken by an employee of the Authority for Nature Reserves that I found really mind-boggling. The Authority for Nature

Reserves is the government agency responsible for the protection of nature and engendered species. The agency's officers monitor hunting and in that role have arrested numerous Thais accused of pouching[16]. In November 24 1994, Journalist Zvi Alush reported in the daily *Yediot Ahronot* that the Arava Valley officer of the Authority of Nature Reserves published a leaflet in the Thai language in which he requested that Thai migrant workers hunt three kinds of birds that were harming local farming. The leaflet, that began with the petition: "Cat and Bird Eaters", was later denounced by an Authority spokesperson, who disclaimed the leaflet. A Thai worker interviewed by Alush confirmed that it was common to hunt birds in Thailand, but insisted that Thai workers were warned against hunting in Israel and refrained from this practice. He added: "this is quite confusing, [hunting is] sometimes allowed and sometimes forbidden". Indeed, supportive reactions by employers and the practical encouragement to hunt specific kinds of wildlife by the authority responsible for curbing hunting conveyed a mixed message and led Thai workers to engage in hunting despite the practice's technical illegality.

Along the years it became clear that the hunting practices of Thai migrant workers in Israel posed a real threat to Israeli wildlife. One major problem was that their very effective traps were designed to catch any creature regardless of its wild or protected status. Both education and law enforcement were employed to deal with this problem, and the Israeli government even engaged the Thai embassy in curbing hunting[17]. Yet despite the substantial damage it entailed, Thai hunting became a secondary issue and did not attract a lot of attention or critique. It was dog-meat eating that became the focus of Israeli media and public attention in the late 1990's.

Dog Meat

Thai migrant workers in Israel farmed poultry, purchased different kinds of meat, received meat leftovers from their employers, stole and hunted a wide range of animals so as to consume their flesh. Though some of these culinary practices were at least tolerated by their Israeli employers, and while some accusations of engaging in culinary taboos were bogus, my findings support the argument that the Thai migrant workers in Israel routinely transgressed Israeli-Jewish culinary norms. I also realized that among Israeli Jews, none of these offenses was as disturbing as the consumption of dog meat. The puzzle, however, was that Thai workers did not eat dogs. While I cannot account for every Thai migrant worker nor every animal caught in their traps, I can say with confidence that, despite Israeli conceptions otherwise, dog meat was not part of the Thai migrant workers' diet.

Thai migrant workers and their Israeli employers vehemently rejected the accusations of dog-meat eating. While there were good reasons for both parties to deny these accusations, the passionate denial is an important component of my analysis. My observations, however, supported the claims made by Israeli employers that their Thai workers liked dogs as companions, that they groomed and petted their owners' dogs, and that in many cases had their own pet dogs. Indeed, in the

article on Thai dog hunting analyzed earlier, journalist Regev reported: "Interesting phenomenon: some Thai workers adopt puppies and play with them fondly. In the first few months they serve as guard dogs, but when they grow up, they end their lives on the grill". Regev offered no supporting evidence for this claim either, but my observations confirm that many Thai workers owned dogs, who accompanied them to work and returned with them to their dwellings in the evenings. Just like in Thailand, Thai migrant workers fed their dogs with their own food leftovers. These dogs became important companions for the Thai workers during their long and often lonely years of working abroad. When I moved with my family to a rural community, we adopted a puppy out of a litter born to a dog owned by a Thai worker. He took good care of the mother and puppies, and made efforts to ensure that all the puppies were adopted. I have seen him with his dogs for quite a few years, and when he left, they were taken over by other Thai workers. These observations may be anecdotal, but they were in line with what many employers told me, further supporting my argument that the Thai workers were generally fond of dogs as companions and did not perceive of them as food.

Media reports of dog eating by Thai workers published along the years demonstrated the pattern I observed in Regev's seminal article: bold headlines proclaiming that Thai migrant workers stole, kidnapped, trapped, butchered, and ate dogs, accompanied by a fuzzy text that left the question of whether dog meat was eaten by Thai workers unsubstantiated and unanswered.

Thus, for example, an article published in 2009[18] under the headline: "Suspicion: Thai workers hunt dozens of dogs", began as follows: "Oz [immigration police] inspectors faced a terrible sight in the yard of a house in moshav *Amioz* in the western Negev, where Thai workers reside. They discovered dozens of skulls, *seemingly* of dogs. The inspectors contacted the Nature and Parks Authority, which launched a joint investigation. Some of the skulls were taken for inspection. *If it is determined that these are the remains of dogs*, the findings will be passed on to the Ministry for the Protection of Environment and the punishment might be imprisonment. If it turns out, however, that *these are the remains of jackals, foxes or other animals*, the illegal hunters will be handled by the Nature and Parks Authority, which may fine and even deport them". The option that these were skulls of "edible" animals or that the Thais had nothing to do with them were not mentioned in the report, leaving the reader convinced that the Thais must have done something cruel to dogs or to other wild animals.

Since everybody knows that Thai migrant workers eat dogs, these reports reinforce the same total social fact that proves their veracity despite a lack of actual evidence. Israelis thus fall into a vicious circle of belief regarding the Thai migrant workers, in line with Frank Wu's argument about the Asian dog eating myth in the west (2002: 40): *"Dog eating is an international urban legend with some truth to it. Everybody knows that Asians eat dogs"*.

WHY DOGS?

In their memorable 1970 sketch "Ascending to The Land" [19], director Uri Zohar and actor and singer Arik Einstein performed a series of scenes that depicted the arrival of Jewish members of different *ali'yot* ("ascends", a term that conveys the elevated spiritual, emotional and material status of Israel in Zionist ideology vis-à-vis the Diaspora), and the contemptuous reaction of their predecessors. Jews of each *aliya*: Russians, Polish, Yemenite, Germans, Moroccan and Georgian, were defined by "traditional" outfits, exaggerated accents and, most importantly, the overacting of stereotypes: the migrants from Russia were depicted as emotional and hot blooded; the Poles sour and bitter; the Germans particular and tedious; the Yemenites religious – and the female Yemenite immigrant (the only woman in the entire sketch), was pregnant, implying to the "primitive" tendency attributed to Yemenites and other immigrants from Middle Eastern countries to bear many children; the Moroccans displayed a combination of oriental religious traditionalism and awkward imitation of Frenchness; and the Georgians were depicted as wild Cossacks. The sketch captures two important sociological traits that are important for my argument: each wave of immigrants to Israel is tagged by a condescending stereotype; and each wave is disliked and ridiculed by its predecessors.

While Zohar's sketch ends with immigrants from Georgia, additional waves of Jewish immigrations arrived in Israel since the 1970's, and each was attributed with its own derogative stereotype intended to relegate the new arrivals into the lower positions in the Israeli social hierarchy. Thus for example, Jews from Communist Romania that arrived in Israel in the 1960's, were termed "Rumanian", though earlier immigrants from the same geographical region were not distinguished as such. "Rumanians" were stereotyped as unsophisticated quasi-Europeans and dubbed "Ashkenazi's Orientals", suggesting that they were less sophisticated and civilized than previously arriving immigrants from Eastern and Central Europe.

When it came to Mizrahi Jews, a common joke in the 1970's described a ceremony that took place in "The National Halls" (Jerusalem's Convention Center): "The Transfer of the Knife" – "from the Moroccans to the Georgians", suggesting that the recent arrivals from Georgia were more violent and primitive even than the Moroccans, who were dubbed until then "*Morocco Sakin*" (Morocco knife). In similar lines, it was argued that "since the arrival of the Georgians, the Moroccans attend concerts" – suggesting for the primitiveness of the former, and the civilizing process incurred on the latter, presumably by the Ashkenazi elite.

The million immigrants or so from the former Soviet Union that arrived in Israel in the 1990's were culturally "processed" in similar lines. A distinction was made between "White Russians", which came from former European Soviet states, and "Caucasians", who came from former Asian republics (Smooha, 2008). The former were historically *Ashkenazi*, but since they could potentially compete with the *Ashkenazi* elite over lucrative jobs and positions that depended on academic and cultural capital (as physicians, scientists, teachers or artists), they were defined

as "Russians" and stereotyped for their "Soviet pushiness", the low quality of their academic education (despite USSR and their own personal scientific achievements) and their "Russian" dress, hygiene and food. Women from the European Soviet republics were stereotyped as "Russian prostitutes". "Caucasians", however, were conceived as yet another "primitive" and violent *Mizrahi* ethnicity and treated accordingly: relegated to Israeli periphery and addressed as primitive and in need of civilizing.

Jews from Ethiopia, many of whom arrived in Israel in heroic voyages and rescue operations, and whose arrival was celebrated as a proof that Israeli state and society were not racist and did not discriminate against blacks, were stereotyped as extremely primitive "stone age" people and relegated the lowest position in the Jewish social hierarchy. The recent wave of Jewish migration from France was treated with similar contempt and stereotyping; mainly by denying their Europeanness and insisting that they were essentially North Africans *Mizrahi*, pretending to be European.

In her analysis of "the great chain of Orientalism", Aziza Khazoom (2003) pointed out that since its inception, Zionism was a modernizing, westernizing project within which each Jewish Diaspora was "Orientalized", that is, stigmatized as "oriental" by its predecessors and relegated to the lower echelons of society – the process that Uri Zohar captured so vividly in his sketch. Though she didn't deal with "Russians", "Caucasians" and "French", Khazoom's model explains why immigrants from Russia were not perceived as Ashkenazi, while those from central Asia were defined as Mizrahi, and why third generation French Jews were dubbed "*Zarfokaim*" (a Hebrew combination of "French" and "Moroccan") and ridiculed for what veteran Israelis felt was an attempt to disguise as French and European: each arriving group had to be Orientalized so as to diminish its threat to the prevailing hegemonic elites and social order, which defines "Western" only those who went through a civilizing process in Israel.

Khazoom's scholarly project and Zohar's artistic critique addressed only Jewish immigrants (and, to some extent, Arabs/Palestinians), though small numbers of non-Jewish immigrants arrived in Israel along the years, most notably the Afro-American Hebrew Israelites, Vietnamese "boat people" and Muslim refugees from former Yugoslavia. These immigrants, however, were perceived by most Israelis as marginal, exotic and strange, as these groups didn't threaten or destabilize the Israeli social structure. The arrival of massive numbers of migrant workers in the 1990's (as well as tens of thousands of non-Jewish African asylum seekers), could not be ignored, nor could these people be dismissed as marginal and exotic. Rumanians, Turks, Chinese, Pilipino, Thai, West Africans, South Americans, Sudanese and Eritrean joined *de facto* Israeli society, and were therefore treated with the same cultural tools used so successfully so as to deal with previous newcomers: orientalizing and stereotyping were applied once again so as to relegate these newcomers into the lowest social strata.

It is important to bear in mind that the decision to import migrant workers was made by Rabin's government, composed of Israel's Zionist Labor Party and

the progressive left. Importing non-Jewish migrant workers breached some of the fundamental values of Socialist Zionism which these parties championed (at least in word), Israeli perceptions of social justice and the Israeli egalitarian ethos (Ram, 1993). It is of little wonder, then, that aggressive Orientalizing and stereotyping were required so as to deal with the moral dilemmas that the mass employment of migrant workers ensued.

When it came to Thai migrant workers, stereotyping was challenging: not only that Israelis had no prevailing stereotypes regarding Thais, but Thailand was (and still is) one of the most popular destinations for Israeli tourists, who rave about its beaches, jungles, temples, palaces, as well as its smiling people and wonderful food. Moreover, Thais were employed by members of the agricultural sector, the epitome of Israeli Zionism, who praise self-reliance ideology, work ethics and socialist ethos. Members of this echelon, composed mainly of kibbutz, and moshav members, dubbed "*hahityashvut haovedet*" (The Working Settlement), were considered by many Israelis "the salt of the earth" and a model for ideal lifestyle and moral standards. It is of little wonder that Israelis found the exploitation of migrant workers by members of this echelon most difficult to digest.

Lack of existing stereotypes and the potential defamation of what was perceived by many as Israel's moral elite, prompted the cultural mechanism described in this chapter. At first it was hunting, specifically that of wildlife, which drew negative attention to the Thais and depicted them as a risk to Israeli nature (though Israeli farming itself is nature's most dangerous enemy). Hunting and gathering further defined them as those who "eat everything", primitive savages that did not develop categorization systems that define edibility, inedibility, and food taboos. As primitive savages, their living conditions could only be perceived as much better in Israel then back home, while their salaries could only be legendary in Thai terms.

But at a certain moment, perhaps but not necessarily because dogs were caught in traps set by Thai migrant workers, a new stereotype has emerged – that of dog-meat eating. The ensuing moral panic, initiated, exacerbated, and maintained by the media, suggested that accusations of dog eating were much more effective than complaints about hunting in convincing Israelis that Thai migrant workers were worthy of exploitation. Thus, even though the hunting practices of Thai migrant workers posed a real risk to the Israeli nature, and even though they did not eat dogs, Israeli media and public attention shifted to dog-eating while hunting remained marginal. The question remaining is why allegations of dog eating proved to be so effective and convincing. This question has nothing to do with Thai culture and can only be understood in Israeli terms.

According to a Ministry of Industry and Commerce 2011 report[20], 12% of Israeli households had dogs, whose number came to 270,000 nationally. Israeli dogs belong in most cases to the category of pets. Israelis were committed to care for their dogs for extended periods of time (av. 7.8 years), and to spend significant amounts of money on their food, grooming and health (almost 1000$ per year). Perceived

as loyal and friendly, "Man's best friend" in Israel usually enjoy their patrons' love, protection and resources. Dogs have first names, and are attributed the family names of their owners when medically and administratively registered.

In his analysis of the taboo on dog meat in the US in the early 1970's, Sahlins (1991: 282) argued that "America is the land of the sacred dog" and explained that (1991: 284): "[d]ogs participate in American society in the capacity of subjects. They have proper names, and indeed we are in the habit of conversing with them... they are one of the family". In her recent study of human-dog interactions in Israel, Shir-Vertesh (2012:420) depicted a more nuanced understanding of these relationships in Israel. Dogs in Israel, she argues, are "loving and loved members of the family, very similar to small children"[21]. Her research makes it very clear that Israeli dogs are important and meaningful family members. Eating them would therefore entail not only breaching a food taboo but rather, murder and cannibalism.

The murderous and cannibalistic nature of Thai migrant workers was the implicit subject of most media reports of their alleged dog eating, exposing the stereotype's meaning and might. As hunters-gatherers, Thai migrant workers may have been perceived as primitive and uncivilized, but as dog eaters they were redefined as murderous and cannibalistic. As such, the moral dilemmas that surround their exploitation and ill treatment dissolved: those who kill and eat man's best friend are hardly human, and hardly deserve human treatment. Once dog meat eating by Thai migrant workers was established as a total social fact, Israelis did not have to bother any more with ethical dilemmas. It was the food myth that redefined the power relations between Israelis and Thais and sent the latter to the bottom of the social hierarchy, were their exploitation was nothing but obvious.

NOTES

1 http://main.knesset.gov.il/Activity/Info/MMMSummaries19/Foreign_3.pdf sampled 25 JAN 2016

2 http://www.piba.gov.il/PublicationAndTender/ForeignWorkersStat/Documents/oct2015.pdf sampled 22 FEB 2016

3 For current data about Thai migrant workers, see an article in this issue: Kurlander, Shoham and Kaminer, 2024

4 http://www.piba.gov.il/PublicationAndTender/Publications/Documents/559690_Zchuton_2016_ENG.pdf sampled 22 FEB 2016.

5 For current data about Thai migrant workers, see an article in this issue: Kurlander, Shoham and Kaminer, 2024

6 For current data about Thai migrant workers living conditions see Kurlander and Zimmerman, 2022 .

7 For an expansion on the issue of agricultural labor migrants' living conditions and their current status, as well as the implications of this during the COVID-19

pandemic, refer to the following studies: Kushnirovich and Raijman. 2019; Kurlander and Zimmerman, 2022; Niezna, Kurlander and Shamir, 2021.

8 http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-31001525; http://www.haaretz.co.il/news/education/.premium-1.2051826 sampled 28 Feb 2016, sampled 23 FEB 2016.

9 Raijman and Kushnirovich (2015: 10) point out that prior to the implementation of the bilateral agreements with Thailand in 2010, "the recruiting agencies' fees were exorbitant: slightly over $9,000". The BA led to reduced expenses of 2000-3000 US$ in 2012-13. This remains a high sum in Thai standard, and the outrageous interest rates make it even higher.

10 https://www.hrw.org/report/2015/01/21/raw-deal/abuse-thai-workers-israels-agricultural-sector sampled 23 FEB 2016.

11 http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/27/eating-dog-vietnam-thailand-kate-hodal. Sampled Feb 21, 2016.

12 http://www.cnn.com/2013/06/02/world/asia/thailand-dogs/ Sampled Feb 21, 2016.

13 http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/02/world/asia/dog-meat-trade-in-thailand-is-under-pressure-and-may-be-banned.html?_r=0. Sampled Feb 21, 2016.

14 More reading about the arrival of Thai migrant workers into Israel can be found in Kurlander (2022); Kaminer (2019); Shoham (2017) and in this volume (Kurlander, Shoham and Kaminer, 2024).

15 http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4287586,00.html, sampled March 2, 2016.

16 http://news.walla.co.il/item/129878;
http://www.nrg.co.il/online/1/ART1/998/014.html; see also the Authority's relevant webpage.
http://www.parks.org.il/ConservationAndheritage/Science/Pages/hayotBar.aspx; all sampled March 3, 2016.

17 http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-3500242,00.html, sampled March 3 2016.

18 http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-3777009,00.html. Sampled March 4 2016. My emphases.

19 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GJ3dOsBuUgA, sampled March 10 2016. Zohar was a legendary film director before becoming a born again ultraorthodox Rabbi. Einstein went on to become Israel's premier singer.

20 http://www.moital.gov.il/NR/rdonlyres/A8610DA0-FCF9-4933-B224-58326872638E/0/X11389.pdf, sampled March 15, 2016.

21 Shir-Vertesh points out that these loving relationships may sometime transform: changing circumstances, and especially the birth of a child, may dramatically change dogs' positions to the extent of removing them outside of the home.

REFERENCES

Adams, C. J. (1990) *The Sexual Politics of Meat*. Cambridge: Polity.

Adams, C. (1998) Eating animals. In R. Scapp and B. Seitz (Eds.), *Eating Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press. Pp. 60-75.

Avieli, N. (2011) Dog Meat Politics in a Vietnamese Town. *Ethnology: An International Journal of Cultural and Social Anthropology*, 50,1: 59-78.

Avieli, N. (2018) *Food and Power: A Culinary Ethnography of Israel*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bartram, D. V. (1998) Foreign Workers in Israel: History and Theory. *International Migration Review*, 32(2), 303-325.

Cohen, E. (1999) Agricultural workers from Thailand in Israel. In R. Nathanson and L. Achdut (Eds.), *The new workers, wage earners from foreign countries in Israel*. Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuchad [Hebrew]. Pp. 155-204.

Cohen, A. Kurlander, Y. (2023) Agriculture as a Site of Trafficking in Persons, Modern Slavery and Forced Labor: Between Migrant Recruitment and Worker Rights. *Law, Society & Culture*, 1: 239-264.

Fessler, D. M. and Navarrete, C. D. (2003) Meat is Good to Taboo: Dietary Proscriptions as a Product of the Interaction of Psychological Mechanisms and Social Processes. *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, 3(1), 1-40.

Fiddes, N. (1991/2004) *Meat: A Natural Symbol.* London: Routledge.

Harris, M. (1998) *Good to Eat: Riddles of Food and Culture*. Long Grove: Waveland.

Kaminer, M. (2019) *By the Sweat of Other Brows: Thai Migrant Labor and the Transformation of Israeli Settler Agriculture*. PhD dissertation, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Khazoom, A. (2003) The Great Chain of Orientalism: Jewish Identity, Stigma Management, and Ethnic Exclusion in Israel. *American Sociological Review*, 68(4), 481-510.

Kurlander, Y. (2022) On the Establishment of the Agricultural Migration Industry in Israel's Countryside. *Geography Research Forum* (GRF), 21, 19-34.

Kurlander, Y. and Cohen, A. (2022) BLAs as Sites for the Meso-Level Dynamics of Institutionalization: A Cross-Sectoral Comparison. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 23(2), 246-265.

Kurlander, Y. and Zimmerman, I. (2022) "Suitable Accommodation" for Agricultural and Caregivers Migrants Before and After Covid-19. *Hagira*, Vol. 12 [Hebrew].

Kushnirovich, N., and Raijman R. (2019) The Impact of Bilateral Agreements on Labor Migration to Israel: A Comparison of Migrant Workers Who Arrived before and after the Implementation of Bilateral Agreements. Center for International Migration and Integration (CIMI), Ruppin Academic Center.

Leepreecha, P. (2005) The politics of ethnic tourism in northern Thailand. Workshop on Mekong Tourism: Learning Across Borders, 25, 1-18. http://www.akha.org/content/tourismecotourism/ethnictourism.pdf sampled 21/9/23.

Maneeprasert, R. (1989) "Women and Children First"? A Review of the Current Nutritional Status in the Highlands. In J. McKinnon and B. Vienne (Eds.), *Hill Tribes Today*. Bangkok: White Lotus-Orstom, 143-158.

Mauss, M. (2002) *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Niezna, M., Kurlander, Y and Shamir, H. (2021) Underlying Conditions: The Increased Vulnerability of Migrant Workers Under COVID-19 in Israel. *Journal of Modern Slavery: A Multidisciplinary Exploration of Human Trafficking Solutions,* 6(2), 133.

Oliver, C. (2023) Mock Meat, Masculinity, and Redemption Narratives: Vegan Men's Negotiations and Performances of Gender and Eating. *Social Movement Studies*, *22*(1), Pp. 62-79.

Raijman, R. and Kushnirovich, N. (2015) Recruitment of Migrant Workers in Agriculture and Construction in Israel: The Impact of Bilateral Agreements. Center for International Migration and Integration (CIMI), Ruppin Academic Center.

Ram, U. (1993) *Israeli Society: Critical Perspectives*. *Tel Aviv: Breirot*. [Hebrew]

Rosenhek, Z. (2000) Migration Regimes, Intra-state Conflicts, and the Politics of Exclusion and Inclusion: Migrant Workers in the Israeli Welfare State. *Social Problems*, 47(1), 49-67.

Sahlins, M. (1991) La Pensée Bourgeoise. In Mukerji, C. and Schudson, M. (Eds), *Rethinking Popular Culture: Contemporary Perspectives in Cultural Studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Pp. 278-288.

Setalaphruk, C. and Price, L.L. (2007) Children's Traditional Ecological Knowledge of Wild Food Resources: A Case Study in a Rural Village in Northeast Thailand. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine*, 3(1), 1.

Shir-Vertesh, D. (2012) "Flexible Personhood": Loving Animals as Family Members in Israel. *American Anthropologist*, 114,3: 420-432.

Shoham, S. (2017) Pickers and Packers: Translocal Narratives of Returning Thai Agriculture Labour Migrants from Israel. MA thesis, Berlin: Humboldt-Universität.

Shvarzberg, Z., (2023) Landscapes in Migration: The Gardens of Thai Agricultural Migrants in Central Israel. Technion – Israel Institute of Technology.

Smooha, S. (2008) The Mass Immigrations to Israel: A Comparison of the Failure of the Mizrahi Immigrants of the 1950s with the Success of the Russian Immigrants of the 1990s. *Journal of Israeli History*, 27(1), 1-27.

Somnasang, P., Moreno, G. and Chusil, K. (1998) Indigenous Knowledge of Wild Food Hunting and Gathering in North-East Thailand. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin*, 19(4), 359-365.

Tambiah, S. (1969) Animals are Good to Think and Good to Prohibit. *Ethnology*, 8(4), 423-459.

Trupp, A. (2015) Agency, Social Capital, and Mixed Embeddedness Among Akha Ethnic Minority Street Vendors in Thailand's Tourist Areas. *SOJOURN*: *Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 30(3), 780-818.

Wu, F. (2002). The Best 'Chink' Food: Dog Eating and the Dilemma of Diversity. *Gastronomica*, 2(2), 38-45.