

precursor to a historically exceptional establishment of the state of Israel, while the capitalist-expansion or colonial-expansion frameworks cast the establishment of Israel in a familiar light hauntingly reminiscent of other capitalist or colonial experiences. Our challenge is to transcend this methodological dichotomy in order to better see both the historically specific aspects of the Mandate period and the commonalities the Mandate had with other similar events elsewhere.

On another plane, the economic literature on the Mandate may be seen as divided into three methodologies regarding causation. Decision-making models focus on individual decisions in the context of preexisting options. This traditional neoclassical approach informs much (but not all) of the dualism literature. This approach tends to be ahistorical in explaining how individuals respond to their options because it tends to have little to say about where those options come from. Nonetheless, in the context of changing options, decision-making theories can be informative. Systems models look beyond the individual but tend to show how a system operates with less ability to show how that system might change.

Exogenous changes dominate the longer term histories of system theorists.

Decision-making theories and system theories tend to be two sides of the same static-history coin. One sees how the individual operates; the other sees how the system operates. Both need an external “coin flipper” to derive dramatic historical change. Because we are dealing with dramatic historical change during the Mandate period culminating in the establishment of the state of Israel, these two approaches overly restrict our ability to investigate matters, and we will look for a