

goes counter to the prevalent view of white settlers' secession as the result of antagonistic struggle between the settlers and their mother metropolitan countries. In his article, "White Settler Colonialism and the Myth of Investment Imperialism," Arghiri Emmanuel provides an example of this view. Emmanuel emphasizes "the antagonism between the white settlers and imperialism" as an alternative to the Marxist theories of modern colonial policy. He points out the latter's "failure to recognize a third factor that intervenes between imperialists and colonies, the colonialists themselves," implying the emerging of the settlers' colonialism independently of monopoly formation, and counter to the interests of imperialism. He therefore asserts, "whatever the motivating forces behind this adventure, the advanced capitalist world did not receive any supplementary benefit from the direct administration of these new territories." Emmanuel attributes settler colonial secession to the mere aspirations of the settlers: "This motive force proper to colonialism is none other than the colonials themselves." Otherwise, "why was imperialism so bitterly opposed to the white settlers' secession?" he asks. Providing a concrete example, he writes: "Israel is a secessionist colonial state. Its foundation was the object of a long and bloody struggle with England."⁹

Not only does Emmanuel miss the point in emphasizing the secession of the settlers over and above the colonial settlement itself, but he also presents an argument which is historically inaccurate, as will be seen later. He errs in taking the settler community as the starting point of his analysis, trying to relate it to financial imperialism versus imperialism of trade.