

development." (15)

It is interesting to note that neither the Government itself, represented by the High Commissioner, nor Israeli official authors saw government as biased or one sided in its agrarian policy. To the contrary, Israeli writers widely believed that if government were not neutral, it was in favour of indigenous Palestinian agriculturists. (16)

In fact, as the following two examples show high government officials firmly believed that their position was even handed. and that what in government view was good for promoting modern (capitalist) agriculture was also good for all the economy.

In 1928 for example, after an investigation into the economic conditions of the fallaheen in the Northern District, Harding, the District Director suggested that government advance a loan of P.L.50,000 as relief to the fallaheen. However, one year later, in 1929, it was reported that the government agreed to a loan of just P.L.20,000 and that the loan be divided among both Jewish and indigenous Palestinian agriculturists.

As a result the loan was divided as follows: P.L.15,000 paid to the fallaheen in kind -Wheat and barley were bought by government and distributed to the fallaheen- and P.L.5,000 paid in cash to the Jewish agriculturists. (17)

In 1930, after the publication of various reports which demanded that the government do something to help the dispossessed fallaheen, the High Commissioner of Palestine arranged a meeting with representatives of Jewish and Arab agriculturists to lecture them on what was called "the Government role in advancing agriculture in Palestine". In this meeting the High Commissioner provided an empirical example of how the government intended to allocate a grant