

While many authors accept the presence of a direct relationship between the two economies, they do not all agree on the exact nature of this relationship.

Some authors maintain that interdependence and interchangeability characterised the relationship between the two sectors. Jewish capital, it is claimed, was exchanged for Arab land, produce and labour power (Flapan, 1979; Kimmerling, 1983). Authors in this perspective reject the notion that the relationship between the Jewish capitalist economy and the indigenous non-capitalist was one of exploitation. An example is Flapan's dismissal of the argument that Jewish capital in Palestine was colonial or exploitative in nature. 'Unlike colonialism in Algiers and other parts of the Middle East', Flapan argues, 'the Jewish presence in Palestine had improved the standard of living of the indigenous Palestinians' (Flapan, 1979: pp. 68-69).

Neo-Marxists, on the other hand, assert that the relationship between the two economies was one of exploitation. Yet the full proletarianization of the fallaheen, it is argued, was never realized during British colonialism. The Arab labour force which was created in the process was primarily a migrant force. This force only left the village temporarily when wage employment outside was available. These proletarians were able to maintain their status as peasant proletarian throughout by drawing their major income from the village and supplementing it by selling their labour power outside. It is therefore claimed that they were only partially exploited by capital (Carmi and Rosenfeld, 1980; Zureik, 1979).

Emphasis in this approach is placed on the relationship between the village and the employer. It is argued that the internal structure