

There is one other important point of commonality between these two documents. Both have been preserved in private hands, passed down from generation to generation, one for a century and one for almost two centuries. Magritte reminds us that the painting of the pipe is not a pipe. But decades before the 1858 Land Code, we see that a document was a proof of ownership that was worth holding on to. How, then, could it be argued that the fellahin didn't understand the meaning of Land Code reforms, according to which they needed a paper to prove their ownership?

This dissertation has endeavored to demonstrate through documentation and reasoned argument that the soil in which the conventional narrative of the (non)implementation of property-tenure reform in Palestine was planted was not well-suited for sustainable growth. How has it survived then, for so long? Part of the reason has been the assumed lack of sources against which the tenets of the narrative could be examined and analyzed. The *Survey of Palestine* written for the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry in 1945/46 claimed,

...at the time of the occupation of Palestine by the allied forces in 1917 and 1918, the authorities succeeded to thirteen district land registries, the records of which were in a state of complete chaos as regards names of owners, areas and correct definition of the boundaries of the land affected. To add further to the confusion, the Turkish Army in the course of its retreat had removed many of the records to Damascus, Adana and towns in the interior of Turkey. Many of these archives have not been