

major single export crop (15).

The development of production forces in these settlements was also reflected in the forms of production relations at work. Most share-croppers working for the Rothschilds received their shares in cash. Money-rent, which according to Marx is the highest form of rent, was the normal practice in these settlements. The more the peasant became involved in the money economy the more his labour power as an exchange value was sold and the less his other means of production (i.e., tools or animals) were necessary for his participation in the production process. By 1890, one author observed, the 400 Arab families who lived and worked in the settlement of Rishon Lezion were totally dependent on wages received from the Rothschilds. In 1911, the same source added, there were about 1,000 Arab workers temporarily employed in the settlement of Petah Tekva (Kimmerling, 1983: 44).

However, when share-cropping attaches itself to the pre-capitalist economy without effecting new changes in agricultural techniques, the system, to use Marx's words, can become a parasite sucking its own blood. In these situations, surplus labour exploited from the peasants is not used productively but rather as usurious capital. Dealing with this issue, Marx observes:

Usury centralizes money wealth where the means of production are dispersed. It does not alter the mode of production, but attaches itself firmly to it like a parasite and makes it wretched. It sucks out its blood, enervates it and compels reproduction to proceed under even more pitiable conditions. Usury has a revolutionary effect in all pre-capitalist modes of production only in so far as it destroys and dissolves those forms of property on whose solid foundation and continual reproduction in the same form the political organization is based (Marx, Capital, III, pp. 596-97).

In the Marj and Beisan areas, share-cropping was less developed