

Unlike the case of capitalists, and as discussed below, that of agricultural laborers, the 1931 Census did not provide a breakdown of the remaining agricultural population primarily involved in extensive cereal production. Thus, it was not possible to fit them as neatly in Patnaik's categories. However, we can definitely classify them in a more general and schematic manner. For this, I draw primarily on the Johnson-Crosbie Report²⁴ but also on the 1936 survey of 322 villages and the 1944 survey of five villages.

As already noted, the size of a holding, in itself, is insufficient to classify the class position of the holder or to determine the ability to derive a living from it. The nature of the holding and access to other resources need to be considered. For example, in the Johnson-Crosbie Report, only half of the owner-occupiers who owned between one and two *feddans* could live off the land without having to supplement their income by hiring out. However, in general, there is a positive correlation between size of holding and class position, or with ability to live off the holding.²⁵ This was true in Palestine as with all other primarily agricultural economies. This was even truer for the villages surveyed in the Johnson-Crosbie

²⁴It was noted that the Johnson-Crosbie Report had problems with calculations of debt and income, and so on, but it is its classifications of households' income that is important for our purposes here; see Kamen, 246-52.

²⁵Official estimates of the "lot viable" defined as "the holding necessary to support its occupants in a reasonable standard of living" varied widely: 100 to 150 *dunums*; 240 to 320 *dunums*; 400 *dunums* for the Beersheba region; and 400 to 600 *dunums* for hill areas; for irrigated citrus and bananas, 10 to 20 *dunums*. See Hope-Simpson Report, 61-4; Government of Palestine, *Palestine Royal Commission, Minutes of Evidence* (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1937), 42.