

That is why the starting point of his theory of settler colonialism becomes the aspirations of the settler community in the colony, not the contradictions arising in the metropolitan country; and giving rise to the settler community in the first place. Stated in his words: "The settler community could not come to terms with anything: neither with the trusts nor with the metropolitan country....It could be saved only by secession from the metropolis, and by setting up an independent 'white' state. The settlers did not fail to appreciate that this was the case, and soon gave it the concrete form of an explicit demand."<sup>10</sup> Indeed, none more than the case of Israel, which he used to support his argument, refutes this very argument.

As put very well by Fawwaz Trabulsi,

"At its inception, the Zionist movement set up a State-superstructure [the Zionist Congress]...the Zionist aim was to find the territory and people for this 'State-superstructure' to rule....In fact, the whole process of Zionist colonization is one in which this 'State-superstructure' acquired its economic 'base' in Palestine." 11

Secession from the metropolis and setting up an independent Jewish State was never the expression of the settlers' conditions and aspirations. The Zionist idea of an independent Jewish State existed prior to the Yishuv (the Jewish settler community in Palestine). That the Zionist idea was always meant to be a colonial settler state is thoroughly documented by one of the foremost Mideast scholars, Maxime Rodinson.<sup>12</sup>

Putting colonial settlers' secession in the context of an essential antagonism between the settler community and the metropolis, and therefore equating it with the liberation struggle, is a falsification of history.