

"...were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation..." (Marx, 1977:685). All these processes, as Chapter Two will demonstrate, were characteristic of late nineteenth century Palestine.

Authors who dismissed the notion that capitalism developed from within Palestine's pre-capitalist structure tended to limit their understanding of late nineteenth century changes to only one factor -- the ownership of land. Gozansky's inconsistent position in this regard is of special importance. On the one hand, she suggests that these changes reinforced pre-capitalist relations of production and enhanced the state's central authority since land was largely concentrated in the hands of the state, rather than privately owned (Gozansky, 1986:21-23). On the other hand, she agrees with various other authors who have suggested that the capital invested in this land was not accumulated internally but came instead from outside the rural area through urban and foreign capitalists (Gozansky, 1986:26; Saed, 1985; Bear, 1976). This over-emphasis on the ownership of land (i.e., whether the land was state land, privately owned by locals, by urbanites or by foreigners) was, in fact, one of the major issues in the Marxist debate which arose during the 1960s in Egypt. During Nasser's nationalization period, one group of Marxists had strongly defended Nasser's land reforms, arguing that the nationalization of land was the basis for socializing the means of production and, consequently, transforming the Egyptian capitalist structure (Saed, 1981; Abdel-Fattah, 1973). This approach, however, was criticized by other Marxists (Saleh, 1979; Barakat, 1977) who argued that changing the form of land tenure alone (from private into state or from foreign into national) would not be sufficient to transform capitalism in rural Egypt.