

Palestinian economy) as a whole in its interactive components. Thus, to more fully understand the socioeconomic transformation of the country, the concept of a single economy is the most appropriate unit of analysis. A related issue to the question of interaction that weakens Metzger's postulate is his discussion of the "comparative advantages" of the two economies that are the basis for their bilateral trade. From Metzger's own estimates and characterizations of the two economies, it is evident that there is an enormous lopsidedness between the two, especially in the case of capital and other resources. This in itself means that the Arab economy was limited in its ability to compete with the Jewish economy, for example, in manufacturing or intensive agriculture. This competitive edge of the Jewish economy obviously connotes a not insubstantial impact on the Arab economy. There is a problem of logical consistency here.

Finally, if one major purpose of the study of history (and economic history) is to shed some light on the present, in our case the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict, in its socioeconomic and political aspects, then the dual-economy model fails to reveal the essence of the Zionist project in Palestine and its ongoing impact on the Palestinians. This failure can be seen in the attempts to distinguish Jewish European settlement in Palestine from other European settler colonial movements in other parts of the world. To continue to posit uniqueness to Zionist settlement in Palestine is not sustainable by its history or by theory. At the same time, its particular aspects cannot and should not be denied. The insistence on duality stems from an ideological predisposition that rejects the colonial nature of Zionism yet