

There are no detailed data on rural households that would allow a precise quantification of the different strata of the peasantry. However, sufficient information is available, including that on landholdings, wage labor, and the growth in agricultural production, to provide a satisfactory basis for establishing unmistakable inferences about the differentiation among the peasantry. This is, of course, in line with the Marxist approach that delineates the class composition of a society (i.e., the specification of the ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of labor). Specifically, Utsa Patnaik's approach to an analysis of differentiation among the peasantry in India is used.¹⁰ The applicability of this approach to conditions in Palestine will become apparent.

In Chapter 3, the relatively high concentration of land ownership was established. However, a more complete picture of differentiation requires the consideration of access to other means of production, the characteristics of the holding and of the household. It also requires an examination of the available means of consumption (e.g., livestock and the extent it contributes to subsistence).

As in landholdings, access to other means of production was also highly unequal. In the case of machinery, it was primarily used by those involved in cash cropping because of its prohibitive cost. This primarily meant those involved in citrus plantations, intensive vegetable cultivation, and, to a lesser extent, modern

¹⁰Utsa Patnaik, "Class Differentiation Within the Peasantry: An Approach to the Analysis of Indian Agriculture," *Economic and Political Weekly* 11, no. 39 (September 1976): A82-A101; idem, *Peasant Class Differentiation: A Study in Method With Reference to Haryana* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987).