

Report since it dealt with land that was primarily used for extensive cereal cultivation and using the same methods of production. On the other hand, there was the inverse relationship between size of holding and the extent of the need to hire out labor.

In the Johnson-Crosbie Report's category of "owners-occupiers living exclusively on their holding," there were two subgroups. First, there were those who owned over two *feddans* (i.e., over 240 *dunums*). The survey does not specify an upper limit. We know from the 1936 survey that there were holdings in the thousands of *dunums*. However, most of the big holdings were held by absentee landowners, which were excluded from the Johnson-Crosbie Report. If we assume big landownership to be over 1,000 *dunums*, we are left with holdings of wide variation between roughly 240 to 1,000 *dunums*. In the 1936 survey, such holdings represented about 2 percent of the number of holdings and 16 percent of the area of the holdings. Since the average size family could not, given the available methods of production, be able to cultivate much more land beyond 240 *dunums* if at all, it is obvious that such holdings required the use of outside labor either as sharecroppers or seasonal wage labor. The extent of the hiring in of labor varied with the size of the holding and access to other resources. The larger the size of the holding, the more labor was used. We know from the Johnson-Crosbie Report that wages and rent were paid out with the latter being almost three and a half times as the former.²⁶ Thus, those whose holdings approached the high end of this

²⁶Johnson-Crosbie Report, Table XXVI, 23.