

In Palestine, this was largely true, but there were some situations where peasants were both exploited and exploiters (i.e., hired in labor and hired out labor). This was the case when labor was hired in, especially during harvest time, to compensate for the work of the family member who hired out. Obviously, this made sense only when the wages paid out by the family were less than that made by the family member working outside.²⁷

In the case of households who owned less than one *feddan* and trees only and also worked as laborers, most of them clearly belonged to Patnaik's "poor peasants." According to the 1936 and 1944 surveys, 63 and 50 percent, respectively, of those holdings were less than 20 *dunums* (these percentages would be somewhat higher when we consider that some holdings were owned by more than one household). Regardless of what size area is taken as the "lot viable" for extensive cultivation from the different estimates, a holding of less than 20 *dunums* was hardly sufficient for subsistence. Given the high percentages of households with less than 20 *dunums*, and even with less than 5 *dunums*, it certainly appears that for the majority of households working for others was more important than self-employment. If and when available, they worked for wages or cultivated land on a share basis. As was discussed in the sections on debt and landholdings, the sale of land by those households represented a sizeable proportion of the land sales during the agricultural crisis of the mid-1930s and the price increase of the 1940s.

²⁷Sarah Graham-Brown, "The Political Economy of Jabal Nablus, 1920-48," in *Studies*, ed. Owen, 152-3.