

Jewish land purchases, but mainly population pressures “create[d] conditions favorable” for that. The big landowners, who did have the resources to alter the cropping system, did not have easy “access to markets” because of “difficulties of road transport.”<sup>118</sup> The government’s efforts were also insufficient. Nonetheless, some changes were being made in agricultural practices, but with the end of the Mandate, “the full consequences of Jewish settlement for Arab society were never worked out in the context of Palestine.”<sup>119</sup> Jewish land purchases, then, basically hastened the need to alter the cropping system.

In essence, then, Kamen marginalizes the impact of European Jewish settlement and acquisition of land (but he also rejects the idea of its positive impact as in “demonstration effects”), because he deals only with its *direct* effects on adjacent areas. This is a static understanding of European acquisition of land since it does not deal with its major impetus in intensifying the market for land in the whole country. The worsening of the conditions of the majority of peasants cannot be separated from the intensified commoditization of land. Also, the impact of European land acquisitions cannot be isolated from the overall impact of European settlement in conjunction with government policies and the structure and changes in Arab rural society. This impact has to be understood in the context of the role played by each of the three and in connection with each other in the spread of market relations and the further intensified integration of the country in the world

---

<sup>118</sup>Kamen, *Little Common Ground*, 263.

<sup>119</sup>*Ibid.*, 261.