

of strengthening existing village hierarchies,” echoing its practices in its other colonies.

As Owen points out, there was a “significant difference from the formal colonies” which “was that the terms of the Balfour Declaration regarding the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine were written directly into the Mandate.” This meant that the government had

to take measures to facilitate Jewish land purchases, and more generally, to develop the economic resources of the country in such a way as to provide a basis for continuing Jewish immigration. Unlike other colonial governments it was forced to balance Britain’s imperial interests with the contradictory interests of two quite different local communities.

However, I may add, recognizing that significant difference with a typical colony does not preclude the characterization of British policies and the settler movement and their impact within a general colonial paradigm.

The ideological implications of both the capitalist penetration and European colony approaches are that the economic precursors of the establishment of Israel were not unique and reflected more general trends in the expansion of capitalism and the expansion of Europe. Thus, while the dualist approach emphasized the distinctive and historically specific aspects of economic development in the Mandate period, the capitalist and European expansion approaches emphasize the generalizable aspects of the same process. From an ideological perspective, this boils down to asking the following question: Was the establishment of Israel a historically unique and exceptional event, or was the establishment of Israel simply another manifestation of European colonialism and the expansion of capitalism out