

similar analysis shows that the figures of the mid-1920s are comparable to those of 1942-1943 if not slightly higher. As for cattle, it is not possible to judge whether it increased or decreased given the lack of figures prior to 1930. The figures for camels show comparability for the 1920s and the 1930s. As for the other work animals (horses, mules, and donkeys), there are no figures prior to 1930 to make a comparison. The only substantial increase between 1937 and 1942-1943 was in the number of donkeys, while the number of horses declined and mules increased slightly.

This overall lack of increase in the number of animals (and in some cases decrease) is another indicator of the worsening conditions of the majority of Arab peasants coinciding with the other problems of falling prices, bad harvests, and mounting debt of the 1930s discussed earlier. It is also another example of the failure, because of insufficient effort and a meager allocation of resources on the part of the government to mitigate the impact of nature on agricultural production.

Needless to say, the extent of the impact of the lack of increase in the number of animals becomes clearer when we keep in mind the substantial increase in the rural population. In other words, this points to the drop in the average ownership of animals per family. We only have figures on the distribution of ownership for two subdistricts to be discussed later. Given that the animals fed primarily on natural grazing, and knowing that the development of intensive animal husbandry among Arab peasants was extremely limited, distributional changes in ownership would have also occurred along geographical lines deriving from the