

cannot prove a satisfactory explanation to its results or its continuous exploitation, dispossession, and forced exile of the Palestinian people. This ideological predisposition fits neatly with the political attitudes of the “dualists” and the political leadership in Israel that refuses to deal seriously with a resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict on equitable terms. Conversely, coming to terms with the colonial nature of Zionism¹⁰⁶ would mark the starting point for a just resolution of the conflict that recognizes the reality of the intertwined past, present, and future of Palestinian Arabs and Jews in historical Palestine. Without this, the conflict is apt to continue.

The critique so far has tried to establish the inadequacy of the dual-economy approach to understand a more complex process of economic developments during the Mandate. However, given the national goal of the Zionist movement to eventually establish an exclusive Jewish state, efforts were directed at founding separate institutions and policies to enhance them. For example, there was the policy of buying land with public funds and the banning of its sale or lease to non-Jews. Similarly, there was the policy of employing only Jewish labor, although as we have seen that was not completely successful. The important roles of public funds and national institutions were illustrated by Metzger, and are instructive in understanding the separatist objectives of the Zionist movement. This

¹⁰⁶There is a growing number of Israeli social scientists, although still a minority, who are challenging the dual approach with their adoption of a colonial paradigm; see Uri Ram, “The Colonization Perspective in Israeli Sociology,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 6, no. 3 (1993): 327-50.