

The trade status of Palestine, as stipulated by the terms of the Mandate, in spite of the government's contraventions, but also the government's tariff and trade policies, often contradictory, nonetheless, had negative consequences on Arab agriculture and the majority of Palestinian Arab peasants. Thus, for those peasants primarily involved in extensive cereal cultivation, the area sown remained the same with no increase in output, reflecting, besides the obvious lack of intensification, the continued need for these crops as the primary source of subsistence, and the inability to shift to more valuable ones. The increase in price, during WWII, of cereal crops could not have benefited those peasants with no or appreciable surplus beyond their needs. There were those who did benefit from the price increase. In other words, the benefits of the price increase cannot be generalized and their differential impact has been recognized in dealing with the WWII period, an impact that the "dualists" do not address.

The inadequacy of the dual approach has to be sought not only in acknowledging the level of interaction between European settlers and Arab agriculture, which some variants of this approach deny or ignore, but in the overall impact of the former on the latter. It is the impact of an implanted settler capitalist community (including its agricultural undertakings) imbued with ultimate exclusivist goals and having the benefits of an accommodating government policy on a primarily agricultural society.

In addition, the growth in cash crops in Arab agriculture, including the use of more intensive methods, however limited, undermines the argument of some