

Palestinian history never changed throughout the Ottoman rule; the Ottoman state remained the major or only proprietor of land and, consequently, the only extractor of surplus labour; the direct producers continued to depend on the village/commune for land while at the same time remaining "free" from relations of bondage.

Based on these characterizations of the pre-capitalist history of Palestine, Gozansky, not unexpectedly, concludes that no force could have changed the Palestinian economy unless it was a force imposed from the outside. It was only after the imposition of capitalism through British colonial rule and Zionist settlement, she wrote, that Palestine's "...traditional oriental structure was broken..." (Gozansky,1986:23-24). Only then, 'modern' capitalist forms of land tenure evolved and the seclusion and unity of the Palestinian village was broken (Gozansky,1986:25-26).

### **The AMP: A Critique**

The concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production has long been the subject of heated debate. As early as the 1930's various scholars argued that the whole notion was fallacious and ought to be discarded (Rapp,1987; Mandel,1971; Naqvi,1972). It has been attacked on theoretical and ideological bases as well as on empirical grounds. Other scholars have rejected the concept as ethnocentric and culturally biased (Saleh,1979; Hindess and Hirst,1975), arguing that the "Occidental/Oriental" classification, which is geographically determined, renders the concept theoretically untenable.

There is yet another school of Marxists who have adopted the model only in a very critical manner, rejecting what they see as its static