major role in the differentiation of the peasantry.

Finally, there was Carmi and Rosenfeld's argument that "proletarianization not the outcome of village socioeconomic change or, primarily of the expropriation of the peasantry [but] as a process dependent on wage opportunities external to the Arab village." In addition, they do recognize the high concentration of holdings and the landlessness of 30 percent among the peasantry. However, they attribute landlessness and differentiation solely to the pre-Mandate period.

The process of transformation of peasant holders into tenants and sharecroppers and total expropriation was speeded up during the last decade and first decades of the present century, with the capitalization of the land market and resultant land sales by absentee holders-merchants-usurers.⁴³

There was no mention of the major role played by European settlement in the commoditization of land and the expropriation of peasants during these decades. However, more peculiar was having recognized a process of differentiation and expropriation that started in pre-Mandate times, the exclusion of these processes in the Mandate period when conditions became more intensively conducive for them with the development of capitalism.

As for their contention that there was no expropriation of the peasantry during the Mandate, it seems that what Carmi and Rosenfeld had in mind was complete and total expropriation. However, as history has shown and as evident in today's underdeveloped countries, the pace of expropriation could be a very slow one depending on different factors. Nonetheless, Lenin's remarks on the subject

⁴³Carmi and Rosenfeld, 475.