

There are many and increasing studies on the colonial nature of the Zionist project in Palestine and the state of Israel, without losing sight of their special characteristics,¹⁰⁴ and thus there is no need for a lengthy discussion of Metzger's argument. However, two issues, one of a general nature and the other specific, need to be addressed regarding Metzger's contention.

The first has to do with Metzger's conclusion of the inapplicability of the settler colonial model for Palestine based on what he claims were differences in the "allocation" of land and labor and the government's role in that allocation. Taking his argument at face value, I maintain that it is basically reductionist and ahistorical. No single model can explain European settlement in all its manifestations in different parts of the world and at different times. The form and content of settlement (including its various aspects, be they political, military, or socioeconomic) are as varied in their details as in their settlements. However, this specificity of each situation does not nullify the general attributes of settlement as characterized by the movement of Europeans into other lands and the imposition of a new socioeconomic order; nor does that specificity eliminate the general detrimental impact of that process, which Metzger acknowledges in the case of Palestine, on indigenous peoples. At any rate, the acquisition of land in "unregulated markets" was not unique to the Zionist settlers in Palestine.

¹⁰⁴See, for example, Maxime Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1973); Gershon Shafir, *Land, Labor and the Origins of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); and Elia Zureik, *The Palestinians in Israel: A Study in Internal Colonization* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979).