

policies, and its undertaking of building the infrastructure necessary for settler capitalist growth and development. Equally important was that the government provided a protective shield for the settler project by undertaking to suppress the resistance of the Palestinian Arabs throughout the Mandate period but especially during the 1936-1939 Revolt. This shield allowed the Zionist movement to concentrate on pursuing its military and economic buildup.

In summary and conclusion, we can point out the following main shortcomings and problematic nature of the dual-economy approach. First, there is the selective nature, in some versions of the dual-economy approach, of the time frame chosen to illustrate their case. Reference is to those who chose 1936 or the brief period of the Arab Revolt of 1936-1939 and generalized this to the whole Mandate period. Thus, their empirical focus leads them to underestimate or altogether ignore the ongoing Arab-Jewish economic interdependency.

Second, there is the tautological nature of the basis of their argument. In essence, the dual-economy approach tells us that the two economies developed differently because of their differences in “socioeconomic attributes” and in “their markets for land, labor, and capital.” Thus, the dual approach, in general, has only limited explanatory power.

Another problem with this approach is its assumption of surplus labor in agriculture, which is either not explained or attributed primarily to population growth and its consequent pressure on the land. This ignores the more important process by which peasants are alienated from their land. The concept of surplus