

It has been argued here that the dominant paradigm regarding the implementation of land reform in Palestine, presented through this selection of representative works, has not – and cannot – offer substantiating proof of its claims regarding the degree to which the population did not conform to reform. It has been shown that the argument’s currency has been earned through historiographical repetition. A further point to note is that the paradigm is universal. As Lorenzo Kamel’s footnote above indicates, the paradigm has not allowed for the possibility of regional differences which can reasonably have been expected to have occurred in Palestine, as elsewhere.

The study now on your screen or in your hands does not do a lot of things. First, it does not argue that there were not villagers suspicious of reform. Second, in the absence of evidence, I do not argue one way or the other about unscrupulous clerks and heartless mukhtars and shaykhs. Undoubtedly there were some. There were also families who registered enormous tracts of land. Farid al-Salim has noted, for example, that Muṣṭafa Barqāwī registered 7,000 dunams in Ghabat Shufah and the ‘Abd al-Hadis registered 60,000 dunams in al-Sha’rawiyya al-Gharbiyya north of Tulkarm. On the other hand, Yusuf Jarrar is said to have brandished his sword to the tapu official and said, “*This is my tapu*”. By the end of the nineteenth century, his family had apparently lost most of their lands.⁴² What do these numbers and this story mean? They raise more questions than answers. The numbers

⁴² Al-Salim, 102.