

regarding both the gross income (total 1) and expenditure on production (total 3) and the returns provided by the villagers is largely due to differences in market prices. The Commission of Enquiry used redemption prices for the years 1924 and 1927, while the villagers calculated their expenses and income according to 1929 market prices. It must be remembered here that Johnson-Crosbie's "Enquiry.." was conducted for purposes of tax assessment. Simpson, on the other hand, readjusted the figures provided by Johnson-Crosbie according to market prices of 1930.

According to Table Three, the net income of 23,573 "agriculturist" families is in deficit by all standards: The net income provided by the villagers (total income [1+2] minus total expenditures [3]) is in deficit to the amount of P.L.524.119; P.L. 157,000 according to Johnson-Crosbie and P.L.374,584 according to Simpson's estimate.

Moreover, the average net income per family, (arrived at by dividing grand net income by the number of families surveyed) is in deficit to the amount of P.L.22.23 according to the villagers' estimate; P.L.6.66 according to Johnson-Crosbie's; and P.L.15.89 according to Simpson's estimate. In other words, the net income per family, by all accounts, was much less than the expenditures the family incurred on its farm.

Data on income and expenditures presented so far suggests strongly that the Palestinian direct producers during this period were extremely poor, generating a meager income which was largely insufficient for their and their family's survival.

While indebtedness was in large part due to expropriation and taxation, the accumulation of indebtedness also caused more expropriation. Indebtedness continued to be characteristic of rural