

the case with agriculture.

Perhaps the major of the dual-economy approach is that it does not deal with the mutual impact that the interaction had between the Palestinian Arabs and the Jewish community. For example, what impact did the demand for agricultural product and labor by the Jewish European community have, in addition to other factors, on Arab agriculture. Was the increase in wage labor and cash cropping related to this? Metzger's calculations show that most of the Jewish-manufactured products were "exported to the Arab economy." Does this fact mean that the considerable resources available to the Jewish European manufacturing sector inhibited the growth of the Arab one? At a more general level, the dual-economy approach fails to see how the spread of market relations and the intensified integration of the country in the world market impacted the two communities, but more important the classes within, because of the different roles and responses to this process.

Although Metzger acknowledges interaction, it is conceived in static terms. It is confined to a quantitative estimation, as we have seen, of what he calls "bilateral trade" in labor, land, and products. Even at that level, the implications and consequences of that interaction are not dealt with fully, if at all. Similarly, the dual-economy postulate leads to an almost exclusive emphasis on the derivation of aggregate economic indices for each economy that have the effect of sacrificing the structural totality of the overall Palestinian economy: The whole is greater than the sum of the parts. In other words, this approach loses track of the system (i.e., the