

fragmentation of smallholdings over the years.⁵³

What Metzger does here is skirt around the effects of Jewish European acquisitions in reducing the average size of the Arab holding, and at the same time exempts them from any role in the changes in the size distribution of holdings. In other words, Metzger's methodology of observable linear causation and ideological predisposition makes him avoid or not allow him to see the role Jewish European acquisitions played in the intensification of the commoditization of land in the context of the overall increase in market relations. This is not to deny the role and impact of the structure of Palestinian rural society and its internal dynamics in the process of changing property relations. It is rather to assert that that process is best seen through the intertwined impact of several factors.

The differences between the two economies are then dealt with in Metzger's discussion of capital accumulation. "Fixed assets were accumulated and retained largely within the separate 'economic confines' of the Arab and Jewish communities."⁵⁴ In addition, the Jewish economy showed much higher rates of accumulation and investment than the Arab economy such that by 1947 the former's share in the "total fixed reproducible capital" grew to about 52 percent as compared to 17 percent in 1922. The Arab economy's share fell from 76 percent in 1922 to 38 percent in 1947. The share of total investment for 1922-1947 was 60 percent for the Jewish economy, 29 percent for the Arab economy, and the

⁵³Ibid., 98-9.

⁵⁴Ibid., 103.