

excluded from the statistics, or why Jerusalem's many districts were excluded from the Jerusalem province's grain count discussed above. Neither author was aware of these facts.

Both Ruppin and Granott concluded that this data as they understood it was evidence that affirmed that the majority of *fallahin* in the Jerusalem province (and all of Palestine) by this time were sharecroppers, and the majority of farmland in the hands of large landowners.²¹⁸ The significance of this interpretation has been twofold. First, it relates to the economic well-being of farmers. The claim that the majority of villagers were subsistence farmers will be discussed in this chapter. Second, it refers to the degree of desolation of the land and, concomitantly, the room available for Zionist immigration and settlement on the land on the one hand and, on the other, the gap between Zionist and Palestinian levels of production. Granott's argument is clear: "...it was a predominantly agricultural country with a backward system of tillage, whether from the point of view of the exploitation of the soil or of the low standard of life it provided for the majority of its inhabitants. ... the inhabitants were poor and few in numbers, and were not able to till more than a portion of the land which was available for sowing. Large areas were, therefore, left desolate without any occupation ...".²¹⁹ In the following section, we will examine registered agricultural holdings of Hebron's villages according to the *Emlak* register of 1876.

²¹⁸ Granott (1952), 38-39.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 34-35.