

for retirement (Lutfiyyeh, 1965:122-123).

The rural class structure, with its relative homogeneity, has been significantly affected by emigration patterns, most particularly during the period of Jordanian rule (1948-1967). In this respect Migdal's definition of lower status in the village to encompass "those who neither owned land, nor had relatives abroad" holds (Migdal, 1980:64). Furthermore, landlessness, resulting from war dispossession, affected the collective perception of villages who became the recipients of refugees, and compelled many peasants, including those who still have some land, to seek alternative possibilities for their livelihood. Thus, in the border village of Bodros, which lost 3,250 acres of its cultivable land in the war, agriculture ceased to be an option:

With the loss of more than 3/4 of the land acreage which they owned, the villagers' perception of the land as ability to support themselves was changed. They no longer considered the small acreage left as the important ability element for making a decent living. This new situation created pressures on the system to look for new opportunities as alternative solutions since the villagers perceived regaining the land which was lost beyond their ability. (Yacoub, 1967:27)

Returning emigrants, especially those who have acquired sufficient capital, often emerge as a new force in the village. At the early stages of migration the money acquired was used by relatives to "pay their debts, reclaim the lands they had mortgaged in order to raise money for the fares of the emigrants ... and to build new homes." (Lutfiyyeh, 1966:124). But at a later stage enough money was accumulated in the hands of migrants to set themselves as a distinct stratum, often threatening the position of the traditional leadership. Perhaps we can distinguish here three types of consequences of migration on social structure.